OBSERVATIONS
ON THE
FIRST and SECOND
OF THE
CANONS,
Commonly ascribed to the
Holy Apostles.

WHEREIN

An Account of the Primitive Constitution and Government of Churches, is contained.

Drawn from ancient and acknowledged Writings.

GLASGOW,
By *Robert Sanders*, Printer to the City and University, 1673.

OBSERVATIONS

ON THE

First and Second

OF THE

CANONS

Commonly ascribed to the

Holy Apostles.

WHEREIN

An Account of the Primitive Constitution and Government of the Christian Church is contained.

The First CANON.

Ἐπίσκοπος χειροτονείσθω ὑπὸ ἐπισκόπων δύο ἢ τριῶν.

A Biſhop ſhall be ordained by two or three Biſhops.

A BISHOP.

THIS word is ſometime taken for a *Spy*, ſo *Eſtathius ad Homeri* K. ſometime for a *Defender*; ſo *Hector* was called *Biſhop* of *Troy* by *Homer*, *Iliad* ω. There was among the *Athenians* a publick Office ſo called: and in this ſenſe, it was alſo uſed among the *Romans*; ſo *Cicero ad Atticum*, *Lib.* 7. *Epiſt.* 11. tells, That *Pompey* would had him to be, *quem tota campania & maritima ora habeant Epiſcopum, ad quem delectus & ſumma negotii referatur*, ff. *de mun. & hon. leg. ult. parag. item Epiſcopi ſunt, qui præſunt pani & cæteris rebus vænalibus.*

This

This term is sometime in the Old Testament. And *Clemens Romanus Epist. ad Rom.* proves Bishop and Deacon to be no new terms, from *Isai.* 60. 17. Καταστήσω ἐπισκόπους αὐτῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ, καὶ τοὺς διακόνους αὐτῶν ἐν πίστει But in our Edition, we find: Δώσω τοὺς ἄρχοντάς σου ἐν εἰρήνῃ, καὶ τοὺς ἐπισκόπους σου ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ (where, on the way, mark how different the present Edition of the *Septuagint* is, from that which *Clemens* made use of) ἐπισκοπή, is also *Psalm* 109. 8. Among the *Jews*, he who was the chief of the Synagogue, was called *Chazan hakeneseth*, the Bishop of the Congregation; and *Sheliach tsibbor*, the Angel of the Church. And the Christian Church being modelled as near the form of the Synagogue as could be, as they retained many of the Rites, so the form of their Government was continued, and the names remained the same. But more of this afterward.

Clemens Romanus in his *Epistle*, speaks only of Bishops and Deacons. *Polycarp* again in his *Epistle*, speaks only of Presbyters and Deacons; where some object that it would seem, that both in the Church of *Corinth*, to which *Clement* wrote, and in that of *Philippi*, to which *Polycarp* wrote, there were but two Orders of Churchmen, whom the one calls Bishops, the other Presbyters. But if *Polycarp's Epistle* be genuine, then these of *Ignatius*, which he there mentions, must be

be so too, and in them the matter is past Controversie.

*Epiphanius lib.*3. *hær.* 75. tells, that at first there were only Bishops and Deacons, which he saith he had ἐκ βαδυτήτος ἱστορίας; and that *ubi Episcopi erant jam constituti, scripsit Episcopis & Diaconis. Non enim omnia statim potuerunt Apostoli constituere. Presbyteris enim opus est & Diaconis, per hos enim duos Ecclesiastica compleri possunt; ubi vero non inventus est quis dignus Episcopatu, permansit locus sine Episcopo. Ubi autem opus fuit, & erant digni Episcopatu, constituti sunt Episcopi; cum autem multitudo non esset, non inventi sunt inter ipsos, qui Presbyteri constituerentur, & contenti erant solo Episcopo in loco constituto. Verum sine Diacono impossibile est esse Episcopum.* So it seems, that from these profound Histories which he had read, it appeared, that in some Villages there were only Presbyters and no Bishops, because in those places none were found worthy of it. But certainly these places were obliged to depend upon some place where there was a Bishop constitute: For if none were worthy to be Bishops, much less were they worthy to constitute a Church within themselves, and independent. It also appears, that in some places at first, they had no Presbyters: And indeed where the number of Christians was so small (as no doubt it was in many places at first) a Bishop

alone might well have ſerved a whole City: But where the Chriſtians were more numerous, there were need of more hands, to aſſiſt the Biſhop in his work.

As for that of *Polycarp*'s naming no Biſhop, but only Presbyters and Deacons, perhaps he wrote in the vacancy of the See: ſo we find many Letters of *Cyprian*'s *ad Clerum Romanum*, when there was no Biſhop. Beſides, it is known that at firſt the names of *Biſhop* and *Presbyter* were uſed promiſcuouſly.

Presbyters were ſo called, not from their age, as they were men, but from the age of their Chriſtianity: For a *Neophite* was not to be ordained, and the Presbyters did jointly with the Biſhop, both rule and feed the flock. But ſome do ſtretch this too far, as if always the eldeſt Presbyter had been choſen Biſhop.

The *Commentaries* upon the *Epiſtles*, commonly called *Ambroſe*'s, but truly *Hilary*, the Deacons (of which I ſhall ſay nothing, it being now agreed among the Criticks, that they are his) upon the 4th of the *Eph.* After he hath at length ſhewn the difference which was betwixt the Churches in the Apoſtles times, when they were not fully conſtitute, and the ages that ſucceeded, he tells how at firſt all in the Clergy baptized and preached, and that on any day, or where they had opportunity. But afterwards

Deacons

Deacons were restrained in this, and things were astricted to certain times and places. *Hinc est ergo* (saith he) *unde nunc neque Diaconi in populo prædicant, nec Clerici, nec Laici baptizant.* —— *Ideo, non per omnia conveniunt scripta Apostolica ordinationi, quæ nunc in Ecclesiâ est, quia hæc inter ipsa primordia sunt scripta. Nam & Timotheum à se creatum Presbyterum, Episcopum nominat, quia primi Presbyteri, Episcopi appellabantur, ut recedente eo, sequens ei succederet. Denique apud Ægyptum Presbyteri consignant, si præsens non sit Episcopus: sed quia cœperunt præsentes Episcopi indigni inveniri, ad primatus tenendos immutata est ratio, prospiciente Concilio, ut non ordo, sed meritum crearet Episcopum. Multorum Sacerdotum judicio constitutum, ne indignus temere usurparet, & esset multis scandalo.* And like to this is, what he saith on 1 *Tim.* 3. from which words, it would appear, that he thought the *Elder Presbyter*, without any Election or Ordination, succeeded unto the Chair of the deceased Bishop. But this is directly contrary even to what *Jerome* himself saith: neither do we find any such constitution as that he mentions, either in the Acts of the Council of *Nice*, or of any other.

It is true, *Clemens Romanus* saith, That the Apostles ordained their first fruits, τὰς ἀπαρχὰς, to be the Bishops and Deacons of them who should afterward believe: but he adds, δοκιμα-

ζόντες τῷ πνεύματι, trying them by the Spirit (that of diſcerning ſpirits being among their extraordinary gifts) and though they ordained no *Neophyte*, yet there is no reaſon to believe, that either they made the eldeſt Chriſtians, Presbyters, or the eldeſt Presbyters, Biſhops. The choice of *Matthias*, and of the *ſeven Deacons*, ſhews that it went not ſimply by age. St. *James* the younger was Biſhop of *Jeruſalem*, and *Timothy* was but young, when ordained. Yet the difference of *Biſhop* and *Presbyter* ſeems not to have been unknown to *Clemens*, as appears from theſe ſayings of his, ὑποτασσόμενοι τοῖς ἡγεμόσιν ὑμῶν, καὶ τιμὴν τὴν καθήκουσαν ἀπονέμοντες τοῖς παρ ὑμῶν προεστῶσι *præpoſitis veſtris ſubditi & ſeniores inter vos debito honore proſequentes.*— τοὺς προηγουμένους ἡμῶν αἰδεσθώμεν, τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους ἡμῶν τιμήσωμεν. *Qui nobis præſunt revereamur, ſeniores inter nos honoremus*, τῷ γὰρ ἀρχιερεῖ ἰδίαι λειτουργίαι δεδόμεναι εἰσὶ, καὶ τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν ἴδιος ὁ τόπος προσέταχται, καὶ λευίταις ἰδία διακονία ἐπίκειται. ὁ λαϊκὸς ἄνθρωπος τοῖς λαϊκοῖς προστάγμασιν δέδεται. Which by the words that follow, muſt certainly relate to ſome Eccleſiaſtical conſtitution among themſelves, to which he accommodates the terms of the Temple Hierarchy. All which I propoſe without any peremptory deciſion in this matter, ſubmitting it to the judgment of the impartial Reader; For I know there are excep-

exceptions againſt theſe words, yet they do clearly imply a difference and ſubordination betwixt the *Presbyters*, and their *Preſidents*: and what he ſaith of the ranks of the *High Prieſt, the Prieſts, the Levites, and the Laicks*, hath certainly a relation to the Orders of the Church.

The next opinion about the Origine of Epiſcopacy, is that of *Jerome*, and he hath given it very fully, both in his Epiſtle to *Evagrius*, and on the *Epiſt.* to *Titus*, *cap.* 1. He holds, that all things at firſt were governed in the Church, *communi Presbyterorum conſilio*, and that the Biſhops were above the Presbyters, *non ex diſpoſitione dominicâ, ſed ex Eccleſiæ conſuetudine*; And by divers arguments from Scripture, he proves, that Biſhop and Presbyter are one and the ſame, *Acts* 20. they who *v.* 17. are called *Presbyters*, are *v.* 28. called *Biſhops*. *Titus* 1. 5. *he left him to ordain Elders*, and *v.* 7. it is added, *For a Biſhop*, &c. Whence he infers, that Biſhop and Preſbyter are one and the ſame. As alſo *Phil.* 1. the Apoſtle writes only to Biſhops and Deacons: And 1 *Tim.* 3. he gives the Rules only to Biſhops and Deacons. S. *Peter* alſo called himſelf Συμπρεσβύτερος· And S. *John* deſigns himſelf the Elder.

But he adds, after there aroſe Schiſms, and one ſaid, I am of *Paul*, &c. *Toto orbe decretum*

est, ut unus cæteris super imponeretur ad quem omnis Ecclesiæ cura pertineret, & Schismatum semina tollerentur -- ut Schismatum plantaria evellerentur ad unum, omnis sollicitudo est delata. And *ad Evagrium*, he tells how *Alexandriæ à Marco Evangelistâ usque ad Heraclam & Dionysium, Presbyteri semper unum ex se electum, in excelsiori gradu collocatum Episcopum nominabant. --- Quid enim excepta ordinatione facit Episcopus, quod Presbyter non facit. —— Et, ut sciamus traditiones Apostolicas sumptas de Veteri Testamento; quod Aaron, & filii ejus, atque Levitæ, fuerunt in Templo, hoc sibi & Episcopi, & Presbyteri, & Diaconi vendicent in Ecclesia.* And from these words we may observe, that he accounted the difference of Bishop and Presbyter, an Apostolical tradition, which came in place of the difference that was betwixt *Aaron* and his Sons: as also, that this began from the time of the Apostles, and of *Mark* the Evangelist: That it was done to evite Schism, and that it was appointed through the whole World: as also, that the whole care and chief Power was in the hands of the Bishop, of which he saith further, *Dial adv. Luciferianos. Ecclesiæ salus in summi Sacerdotis dignitate pendet, cui si non exors quædam, & ab omnibus eminens detur potestas, tot in Ecclesiâ efficientur Schismata, quot Sacerdotes.* It may seem likewise probable, from him, that Presbyters chooſed their Bishop out of their own

own number, and that in *Alexandria* they made him Bishop without any new Ordination. And of this *Eutychius Patriarcha Alex.* who was not very long after *Jerome*, speaks more plainly, for he in his *Origines Ecclesiæ Alexandrinæ*, published by *Selden*, *pag.* 29. 30. tells, that there were twelve Presbyters constitute by S. *Mark*, and when the See was vacant, they did chuse one of their number to succeed, and to be their Head, and the rest laid their hands upon him, and bless'd him: yet this cannot hold true, as shall afterwards appear.

But all *Ignatius* his *Epistles*, are full of the subordination of Presbyters to Bishops, not without very hyperbolical magnifications of the Bishops Office. It is true, in the *vulgar Editions* these expressions are much more frequent; but in the *Medicean Codex* (published by *Vossius*, which agrees not only with the old Latin one published by *Usher*, but also with the citations of *Theodoret*, and *Athanasius*, and other ancient Writers which they have taken out of them) there is a great deal of the subordination of Presbyters to Bishops. *Ep. ad Tral.* he saith, *Necessarium est, quemadmodum facitis sine Episcopo nihil operari. —Omnes revereantur Episcopum ut Jesum Christum existentem filium Patris, Presbyteros autem, ut concilium Dei, & conjunctionem Apostolorum.* To the *Ephes.* he bids them be subject τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ,

καὶ πρεσβυτερίῳ, and concludes that they should obey these ἀπερισπάστῳ διανοίᾳ. In his *Epist.* to the *Magnesians*, he saith, *Quantum Episcopum quidem vocant, sine ipso autem omnia operantur:* wherefore he adviseth them, *ut omnia operentur præsidente Episcopo in loco Dei, & Presbyteris in loco confessionis Apostolorum.* And there he speaks of the age of *Damas* their Bishop, who was but a young man, which he calls according to the vulgar Edition, τὴν φαινομένην νεότητα, but in the *Medicean Codex*, τὴν φαινομένην νεωτερικὴν τάξιν, from which some will infer, that Episcopacy was then newly invented, but suppose that were the true reading, which some question, who in this prefer the vulgar reading, it is clear from the whole Epistle that he is speaking of the Bishops age, and not of Episcopacy. And from 2 *Tim.* 2. 22. we see νεωτερικὴ is properly youthful, and καινὴ is that which is new. And what tho *Ignatius*, who lived so near the Apostles time, did call Episcopacy *a new Order?* Many other places to the same purpose of the difference among these Offices occur through all his Epistles, neither is there any room for debate: but if these Epistles be his, the difference of Bishop and Presbyter hath begun in the Apostolical times. But that debate would prove too long a digression here; therefore I refer the Reader, if he desire a full discussion of that question to the in-

incomparably learned and exact defence of them, lately publiſhed by *Doctor Pearſon*, whoſe harveſt is ſo full, that he hath not ſo much as left work for a gleaner.

That of the *Angel* in the *Revelation*, is brought by many, and that not without ground, to prove that there was ſome ſingular perſon in theſe Churches to whom each Epiſtle was directed, and we have a great deal of reaſon to believe that *Polycarp* was then Biſhop of the Church of *Smyrna*. *Iren. lib.* 3. *cap.* 3. and *apud Euſeb. lib.* 4. *cap.* 13. tells that *Polycarp* was ὑπὸ ἀποστόλων ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἐν Σμύρνῃ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος καταστὰς. Now *Irenæus* tells how he was *Polycarp* his hearer and diſciple, and had converſed with him in his youth, and had often heard him teach. And as it were great uncharitableneſs to ſuſpect the truth of his narration in a matter of fact, ſo we cannot think he could have been miſtaken in a matter of that importance. But whatever jealouſie may fix upon *Irenæus*, there is no ſhadow of ground, for ſuſpecting either the veracity, or good information of the Church of *Smyrna*, who (giving an account of his Martyrdom in an Epiſtle inſerted by *Euſeb.* in his Hiſtory, *lib.* 4. *cap.* 14.) call him Biſhop of the Catholick Church of *Smyrna*.

All that can be alledged againſt this, is, that in their ſtile *Biſhop* and *Presbyter* were one and the

the ſame thing. But the contrary of this is clear from *Irenæus*, who ſpeaks always of Biſhops as diſtinct from Presbyters: and tho he ſometimes call Biſhops *Presbyters*, yet he never calls Presbyters, *Biſhops*; which is alſo the ſtile of theſe few Writers of that age, who ſometimes call Biſhops, *Presbyters*. *Euſebius* tells from the teſtimony of the Church of *Lions*, how he was firſt a Presbyter in *Lions* under *Pothinus*: after whoſe Martyrdom he ſucceeded him in the Chair, and died Biſhop there. And if we will hear himſelf, *lib.* 3. *cap.* 3. when he is reckoning up the tradition of the Faith from the Apoſtles, he deduceth it by all the Biſhops who did ſit in *Rome* from the Apoſtolick times: whence two things will follow; one, that he judged there had been ſtill Biſhops in that Church. The other, that he looked on the Biſhop, as the chief depoſitary of the faith.

Further, *Euſeb. lib.* 5. *cap.* 24. ſets down his Epiſtle to *Victor* Biſhop of *Rome*, wherein he chides him for excommunicating the *Eaſtern* Biſhops; and there he lays the whole blame upon *Victor*, without ſharing it among the Presbyters, and alſo commends the former Biſhops of *Rome* for their greater gentleneſs; whereby it plainly appears, that he judged that the power of diſcipline lay chiefly in the Biſhops hands. *Polycrates* alſo (*apud Euſeb. lib.* 5. *hiſt. cap.* 23.)

vindi-

vindicates the practice of their Church about the day of *Eaſter, not only from the example of the Apoſtles among them, but of the ſeven Biſhops who preceded him in his See.* From which we may not only infer, that there was but one Biſhop in a City, from the days of the Apoſtles; but that his authority was great, ſince what they did, paſſed for a precedent to their Succeſſors. And indeed the difference of Biſhop and Presbyter, is ſo evpreſs in *Irenæus*, that the moſt learned aſſertors of parity, confeſs the change was begun before his time, which was in the end of the ſecond *Century*. Now how this change could have been introduced, when there was neither Council, nor ſecular Prince to eſtabliſh it, when Churchmen were ſo pure (*Polycarp* an Apoſtolical Man, having died but about thirty years before; beſides many other Apoſtolical men who had long ſurvived) when the Church was in the fire of perſecution, and ſo leſs droſs could be among them; when there was no ſecular intereſt to bait them to it: for on the contrary this ſubjected them to the firſt fury of the perſecution, ſeems ſtrange. And it is not eaſie to be imagined, or believed, how this could have been ſo ſuddenly received through all the Churches, both *Eaſtern* and *Weſtern*, and that there was none to witneſs againſt it; and that neither the ſincerity of ſome Presbyters, nor the pride

of

of others, ſhould have moved them to appear for their priviledges againſt this Uſurpation: And how neither Heretick, nor Schiſmatick, ſave one, and that about two hundred years after, ſhould have charged the Church with this: on the contrary, all of them having their own Biſhops; and how this Government continued in ſo peaceable poſſeſſion through the ſucceſſion of ſo many ages, till of late, that even fundamentals are brought under debate; if this Superiority were either ſo criminal, as ſome hold it to be, or had not been introduced at leaſt by ſome Apoſtolical men, if not by the Apoſtles themſelves, will not be eaſily cleared.

In the next *Century* we have *Tertullian* ſpeaking clearly of the difference of *Biſhops, Presbyters* and *Deacons, lib. de bapt. Dandi quidem jus habet ſummus Sacerdos, qui & Epiſcopus, dehinc Presbyteri & Diaconi, non tamen ſine Epiſcopi authoritate, propter Eccleſiæ bonum.* Idem *de præſcript. adverſ. hær. cap.* 32. *Cæterum ſi quæ* (præſcriptiones) *ſe audent inſerere ætati Apoſtolicæ, ut ita videantur ab Apoſtolis traditæ. — Edant ergo origines Eccleſiarum ſuarum, evolvant ordinem Epiſcoporum ſuorum, ita per ſucceſſiones ab initio decurrentem, ut primus ille Epiſcopus, aliquem ex Apoſtolis, vel Apoſtolicis viris, qui tamen cum Apoſtolis perſeverarent, habuerit authorem & anteceſſorem; hoc enim modo Eccleſiæ Apoſtolicæ cenſus ſuos deferunt,*

ferunt, ſicut Smyrneorum Eccleſia habens Polycarpum, à Joanne collocatum refert: ſicut Romanorum à Petro Clementem ordinatum edit. Proinde utique & cæteræ exhibent, quos ab Apoſtolis in Epiſcopatu conſtitutos Apoſtolici ſeminis traduces habeant; confingant tale aliquid hæretici. He alſo *lib.* 4. *cont. Marcionem, cap.* 5. ſaith, *Ordo tamen Epiſcoporum ad originem recenſus, in Joannem ſtabit authorem.* By which we ſee that he both judged Biſhops to be of an Apoſtolical origene, and that he counted them different from Presbyters. A little after him was *Clemens Alex.* who 6. *Strom.* p. 667. ſpeaking of the Conſtitution of the Chriſtian Churches, ſaith, there were among them ἀρχόπαι ἐπισκόπων, πρεσβυτέρων καὶ διακόνων, which he thinks was taken from the Angelick glory, and from their Oeconomy and adminiſtration.

We ſhall alſo find through all *Cyprian* his Epiſtles this diſparity ſo clear, that it cannot be denied, thæt yet we find him as condeſcending as any. *Epiſt.* 6. writing to his Clergy: he ſaith, *Solus reſcribere nihil potui, quando à primordio Epiſcopatus mei ſtatuerim nihil ſine conſilio veſtro, & ſine conſenſu plebis meæ, privata gerere ſententia.* But even this looks like a yielding to a diminution of that plenitude of power to which he might have pretended, *Epiſt.* 65. writing to *Rogatian*, who had adviſed with him concerning a Deacon

that

that had carried insolently toward him, he writes: *Pro Episcopatûs vigore, & Cathedræ authoritate, haberes potestatem, qua posses de illo statim vindicari.* (and about the end) *Hæc sunt enim initia hæreticorum, & ortus atque conatus Schismaticorum male cogitantium, ut sibi placeant, ut præpositum superbo tumore contemnant, sic de Ecclesiâ receditur, sic altare profanum foris collocatur, sic contrà pacem CHRISTI, & ordinationem, atque unitatem DEI rebellatur.* Likewise we find *Epist.* 31. written to *Cyprian*, by the *Clerus Romanus*, the Seat being then vacant, what sense they had of the Bishop's power, when they say: *Post excessum nobilissimæ memoriæ Fabiani, nondum est Episcopus propter rerum & temporum difficultates constitutus, qui omnia ista moderetur, & eorum qui lapsi sunt possit cum authoritate & consilio habere rationem.* And if in any case we receive a testimony, it should be from the mouth of those who can only pretend to be injured. My next witness shall be *Dionysius* of *Alexandria*, whose fame and authority was inferiour to none of the age he lived in. I do not bring his words to prove there were Bishops in the Church in his time, since that is denied by none: But to prove how full and absolute the authority of the Bishops was then, and that the Presbyters were simply determined by their commands. Great care was used to keep the Christian Assemblies pure; and there-

therefore such as fell in scandalous sins, chiefly these who apostatised in the persecution, were not admitted to the Communion of the faithful, but after a long and heavy penitence: And a question rising, What should be done with those who died before they finished their penitence: he in his Letter to *Fabius* Bishop of *Rome*, telling that signal story of *Serapion*, shews that in his Diocese the Presbyters sent the Eucharist to the sick who desired it, though they died before they had compleated their penitence: and he adds how this was by his authority, ἐντολὴς δὲ ὑπ' ἐμοῦ διδομένης, τοὺς ἀπαλλαττομένους τοῦ βίου, εἰ δέοιντο, καὶ μάλιστα εἰ καὶ πρότερον· ἱκετεύσαντες τύχοιεν, ἀφίεσθαι· ἵν' εὐέλπιδες ἀπαλλάττωνται. Where from the stile of a *Command given by him, which was the rule of his Presbyters*, and the rest of that Epistle, it is as clear as any matter of fact can be, that the authority of *Bishops over their Presbyters was then full, absolute, and undisputed.*

If we will believe *Eusebius*, who certainly hath been a diligent and great Collector, as any of all the Ancients, the whole Tract, both of his History and Chronology, runs fully in this strain; and he gives us the Catalogues of the Bishops of the Patriarchal Sees, from the days of the Apostles to his own time. And tho it is not to be denied that he hath been too credulous in some instances; yet it is hard to think he could

could have been miſtaken in ſuch a Tract of ſo many particulars. And we ſee from the ſixth Canon of the Council of *Nice*, τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατείτω. That the power of *Metropolitans* over Biſhops, was then accounted by that Council an ancient Cuſtom; neither was there ever any oppoſition made to this before *Aërius*, who upon that account is reckoned an Heretick by *Epiph. lib.* 3. *hær.* 75. and alſo by *Auguſtin ad Quod vult Deum, hær.* 53. *Epiphanius* adds, that he was an *Arrian*, and gives the account of his Opinion in this matter, thus: *Aërius* being a Presbyter in *Sebaſtia*, was offended when *Euſtathius* was preferred before him to that Biſhoprick: and tho *Euſtathius* took all ways to gain him, and committed the *Xenodochium* that was there to his inſpection, yet *Aerius* too deeply irritated at the preference, ſaid: *Quid eſt Epiſcopus ad Presbyterum; nihil differt hic ab illo, unus enim eſt honor, unus ordo, & una dignitas. Imponit munus Epiſcopus, ita etiam Presbyter; lavacrum dat Epiſcopus, ſimiliter & Presbyter. Diſpenſationem cultûs divini facit Epiſcopus, facit & Presbyter ſimiliter; ſedet Epiſcopus in throno, ſedet etiam Presbyter.* By which he deceived many, and had divers followers: but it ſeems they have died with their Author, for we hear no more of them.

Medina in the Council of *Trent*, numbred with *Aerius*, *Jerome*, *Ambroſe*, *Auguſtine*, *Chry-*

Chryſoſtom, *Theodoret*, *Primaſius*, and *Sedulius*, as if they had been of the ſame mind, wherein he certainly ſpoke raſhly, and was either ignorant or indeliberate. We have already conſidered both *Jerome* and *Ambroſe*, or rather *Hilary* the Deacon, their opinions in this matter.

All that is gathered from *Auguſtine*, is, *Ep. ad Hieronymum*, where he ſaith: *Quanquam ſecundum honorem vocabulorum, quæ jam uſus obtinuit, Epiſcopatus Presbyterio major ſit, multis tamen in rebus Auguſtino Hieronymus major eſt.* Whence ſome would infer that the difference of theſe was only in words, and brought in but by cuſtom: But how thin and weak this is, it being but a ſmooth Complement, will appear to all, eſpecially if they ſet it in the balance with the great evidence that ſtands upon the other ſide.

Chryſoſtom. hom. 11. on 1 *Tim.* when he is giving the reaſon, why the Apoſtle paſſeth from Biſhops to Deacons, without giving rules to Presbyters, ſaith, the reaſon was, ὅπερ ἐπὶ πολὺ τὸ μέσον, καὶ γὰρ, καὶ ἄλλοι διδασκαλίαν ἀναδεδεγμένοι, καὶ προεδρίαν τῆς ἐκκλησίας. And a little after, he taxeth what that little betwixt them was, τῇ γὰρ χειροτονίᾳ μόνῃ ἀλλήλων ὑπερβεβήκασι, καὶ τούτῳ μόνον, δόκιμοι πλεονεκτεῖν τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους. But this is far from ſaying that they were all one; and that there ought to be no difference betwixt

them. *Chryſoſt.* alſo in his firſt Homily on the *Phil.* 1. *cap.* on the word σὺν ἐπισκόποις, ſaith, *Quid hoc rei eſt? An unius Civitatis plures erunt Epiſcopi? nullo modo. Verum ſic Presbyteros vocavit, tunc enim nomina invicem communicabant, & Diaconus dicebatur Epiſcopus.* And there he ſhews that Biſhop and Presbyter were taken promiſcuouſly; for which he cites that of *Timothy's* being ordained by the Impoſition of the hands of the Presbytery, which he ſaith is to be underſtood of Biſhops. *Quia Presbyteri Epiſcopum non ordinaſſent.* (And a little after) *Etiam Presbyteri olim appellabantur Epiſcopi, & Diaconi Chriſti, & Epiſcopi Chriſti, unde nunc etiam multi Presbyteri & Diaconi ſcribuntur Epiſcopi.* But he adds, that in proceſs of time, each had their proper names appropriated to them.

OEcumeneus and *Theophylact*, in this, and all other things, follow *Chryſoſtom* καὶ πόδας. As alſo *Primaſius*, who on 1 *Tim.* 3. gives the reaſon, why the Presbyters are not named. *Eos in Epiſcoporum ordine comprehendit, quia ſecundus, imo pene unus eſt gradus.* *Sedulius Scotus* on the 1. of *Titus*, ſaith *verbatim*, that which *Jerome* hath on the ſame place, and ſo it is to be conſidered as all one with him on the matter.

But *Theodoret's* opinion is a little more perplext, who on 1 *Tim.* tells, that *the ſame perſons were called ſometimes Presbyters, ſometimes Biſhops:*

Bishops: but these who are now called Bishops, were then called Apostles, and that in the progress of time they left the name of Apostles, and the name of Bishops was appropriated to them who were first called Apostles. Thus he. These words it seems dropped from him without consideration, for there is no shadow of ground to believe it was so; otherwise how came it, that the Apostle gave no rules for them, under that name. But these words are sufficiently tossed by *Petavius* and *Wallo Messalinus*. And thus far we have an ingenuous account of the various Sentiments of the *Fathers*, about the disparity of *Bishops* and *Presbyters*.

The next thing in this *Canon* to be consider'd is, what is meant by χειροτονία. It is unquestionable, that by this is understood Ordination by Imposition of hands, for all the Ancients use χειροτονία, & χειροθεσία promiscuously: But Criticks judge that by the former we are to understand all that pertained to the Ordination, and the whole Office of it, and that the latter is to be restrained to that particular rite of Imposition of hands given in the Ordination. Nor do I remember of any place, where χειροτονία stands for the Election of Churchmen, except in the fifth *Canon* of *Laodicea*, which discharges it to be in the presence of the hearers: and if we compare that with the 13th *Canon* of the same

Council, which discharges the popular elections, we shall see the reason why they likewise forbid the elections to be in the peoples hearing, which was for avoiding tumults. *Balsamon* on this *Canon* refutes their mistake, who understood it περὶ ψήφου, which was διὰ τὴν τῶν χειρῶν ἔκτασιν, who founded their gloss on that *Canon* of *Laodicea*, (which *Zonaras* and *Aristenus* doth) *Quæ enim fit in Ecclesia ordinatio per preces mysticas peragitur, etiamsi fiat coram multis.* And he proves his gloss from the 4. *Canon* of *Nice*, which appoints the elections of the Bishops to be by the whole Bishops of the Province, or by three at least. Therefore this *Canon* cannot be meant of the elections of Bishops, since two suffice by this rule for a χειροτονία; and by the recurring of this same word in the next *Canon*, he confirms his assertion, since Presbyters and Deacons were not (according to him) elected by Suffrages. Whence we see, how groundless a nicety theirs is, who would distinguish them, as if the former had been the election, the latter the ordination. It is true χειροτονέω is in the *Greek* Authors almost constantly taken for the election of Magistrates, which was ordinarily done in *Greece* by the extention or elevation of the hand; so *Budæus* upon the word, and *Cicero pro Flacco* speaks of their *psephismata porrigenda manu, profundendoq; clamore concitata.* But that distinction

is

is not obſerved in ſacred Writings, in which theſe minute critical Modes of ſpeaking are not attended to, and ſince, before they were to lay on hands, they were to ſtretch forth their hands on the head of the perſon, this word is not improperly uſed for that action: and therefore, *Acts* 14. 23. χειροτονήσαντες is uſed of *Paul* and *Barnabas* their ordaining of Elders, where it is clear, it cannot be meant of the election by the people, but of their Ordination of Paſtors.

This word in Scripture is alſo uſed for an appointment, or election, *Acts* 10. 41. προχειροτονία is taken for GOD's election; and 2 *Cor.* 8. 19. it is applied to theſe who were choſen to carry a Meſſage. As for the Ordination of Churchmen, it is nothing elſe but *a ſolemn Ceremony of bleſſing them, by laying on of hands.* We find of old, that all who were called out for any Divine Service, were ſolemnly ſeparated for it, ſo were both Kings, Prieſts, and Prophets. And the Law of Nature ſaith, that to all Functions for which a great veneration is due, there ſhould be a ſolemn Inauguration. The laying of the hand upon the head, was the rite of Benediction, *Gen.* 48. 14. *Jacob* bleſſing *Joſeph*'s Children doth it with that Ceremony: In like manner, *Deut.* 34. 19. did *Moſes* bleſs *Joſhuah.* We ſee alſo by the ſinners laying on their hands on the head of the Sacrifice, that is was a Cere-

mony uſed in the devoting of things to GOD, whence might riſe that phraſe among the *Latins caput devovere.* And upon theſe accounts, this was appropriated to the Ordination of Churchmen, who are to be both bleſſed, and devoted to GOD.

We find this ceremony alſo uſed in the New Teſtament on many and different occaſions; ſometimes when they healed diſeaſes, *Mark* 16. 8. *They ſhall lay their hand on the ſick, and they ſhall recover.* And our LORD uſually touched the ſick with his hand. *Acts* 28. 8. S. *Paul* lays his hands on *Publius.* Likewiſe, when they conferred the holy Ghoſt on any who were baptized, they uſed this ceremony, ſo *Acts* 8. 17. *and* 19. 6. And farther, when they appointed any for the Miniſtery of the Goſpel, they ſeparated and bleſſed them, by the laying on of hands; ſo 1 *Tim.* 4. 15. *and* 5. 22. *and* 2 *Tim.* 1. 6. Deacons were alſo ordained by this ceremony, *Acts* 6. 6. As alſo when they ſent any on a particular miſſion, though already ſanctified for the work of the Goſpel, they laid hands on them: ſo *Acts* 13. 3. *Paul* and *Barnabas* were ordained for the Miniſtery of the *Gentiles.* From all which it is clear that they uſed impoſition of hands, as the conſtant ceremony of Benediction, and as a concomitant of it, and not as a ceremony of it ſelf ſignificant and ſacramental.

Among

Among the Ancients, Impoſition of hands was uſed not only in Confirmation, which is undoubted, and is by many founded on that of *Hebrews* 6. 2. where laying on of hands being joined with Baptiſm, and reckoned among foundations, ſeems to be common to all Chriſtians. But they alſo uſed it in the receiving of penitents: ſo 19th Canon of *Laodicea*.

As for the form of ordaining Biſhops, we ſee here it was to be done by Biſhops, which is agreed to by all, only *Eutychius* ſeems to ſay, that in *Alexandria* Presbyters ordained the Biſhop. But as for the number of the Biſhops who were to ordain, this ſeems to be later, and more ſutable to the ſtate of the Churches after they were conſtituted, than while they were under perſecution. The number of three was appointed, *Conc. Arel.* 1. *Can.* 21. *Nic. Can.* 4. *Arel.* 2. *Can.* 5. *Carth.* 2. *Can.* 12. And ſee more of this *Gratian diſt.* 64. This ſeems to have been founded on *Timothy*'s Ordination, which is ſaid to have been done by the Presbytery, which *Chryſoſtom* underſtands of a Company of Biſhops. But it is not probable, that in the time of perſecution, when Biſhops neither durſt leave their own flocks, nor meet in any number, this was then obſerved; and divers accounts are given of Ordinations, where we hear only of one Biſhop ordaining. *Gregory Thaumaturg* was

ordained by *Fidimus* Bishop of *Amasia*, who went to the Wilderness to seek him. And there are many instances among the Lives of the Solitaries, of such as were brought to a Bishop, and ordained by him, without any other assisting him. So *Synesius Epist.* 67. tells how *Siderius* was ordained a Bishop, only by *Philo* Bishop of *Cyrene*; and tho he call that a Transgression of the ἀκριβεία, and confesseth it was not ἐνθέσμως, but ἐκθέσμως, since he was neither ordained in *Alexandria*, nor by three Bishops; yet he justifies it from the necessity of the times wherein such freedom of Assemblies was not safe. And *Gregory the Great* allowed *Augustine* to ordain alone in *England*; who upon that did ordain some Bishops alone, as *Beda* relates. *Dionysius* the *Areopagite cap.* 5. *de Eccles. hierar.* giving the account of the Ordination of Bishops, represents it as done by one person. *Anno* 555. after *Vigilius* Bishop of *Rome* his death, *Pelagius* who got himself made his Successor, being suspected of accession to his death, could only get two Bishops, to wit, *Joannes Perusinus*, and *Bonus Ferentinus*, who with *Andreas* Presbyter of *Ostia*, laid hands on him. And here is a Presbyter laying hands on a Bishop. The Church of *Rome*, at this day, ordinarily dispenseth with this, so that one Bishop and two Abbots do often ordain Bishops.

The

The *Areopagite loc. cit.* gives the account of the Bishops Ordination, whom he always calls ἱεραρχὴς, thus: *He who was to be ordained, was brought to another Bishop, and kneeling before the Altar, the Gospels were laid on his head, and the Bishops hand, and so he was consecrated with a holy Prayer, and then marked with the sign of the cross; and last of all, saluted by the Bishop, and whole holy Order.* His Theory on this is: *Their coming to the Altar, shews the subjecting of their whole life to* GOD. *Laying on of hands, is as a Father's blessing of his Child. The sign of the cross signifies, that they are to follow* CHRIST, *even to the cross. Their salutation signifies their union one with another: and the Gospel is laid on the Bishops head, because he being the head of the Hierarchy, is to illuminate the rest.*

With this agrees the fourth Council of *Carthage*, where the rules are at length set down for the tryals and qualifications of Bishops: and Canon first, at the end, we have, *Cum in his omnibus, examinatus, fuerit inventus plene instructus, tunc cum consensu Clericorum & laicorum, & conventu totius provinciæ Episcoporum, maximeq; Metropolitani vel authoritate vel præsentiâ, ordinetur Episcopus.* And Canon second: *Episcopus quum ordinatur, duo Episcopi ponant & teneant Evangeliorum codicem super caput & cervicem* (aliter *verticem*) *ejus, & uno super eum fundente benedictionem, reliqui*

reliqui omnes Epiſcopi, qui adſunt, manibus ſuis caput ejus tangant. And of this ſee *Gratian diſt.* 23. & 77. where we find a Biſhop was to be five years a *Lector* or *Exorciſt*, fourteen years an *Acoluth* or *Subdeacon*, and five years a *Deacon*, ere he be a *Presbyter*, and then he may hope for the higheſt degree. But in another Chapter it is ſaid, he muſt be ten years a *Presbyter*, ere he can be a *Biſhop*. And in another Chapter, none could be a *Deacon* under twenty five years of age. But by the Civil Law, the age both of Biſhop and Presbyter is the ſame; to wit, thirty five. Theſe previous degrees were introduced, and the years of tryal in them were appointed, that all might be prepared and rightly formed before they were admitted to the government of the Church. Among other ceremonies in the ordination of Biſhops, in ſome places they were anointed with the *Chriſma*. *Nazianz. Orat.* 20. tells, that his father had ſo anointed *Baſile*: and *Orat.* 5. tells, that himſelf was ſo ordained: but it ſeems that that was a cuſtom peculiar to that Country, ſince we meet not with it ſo early elſewhere.

As for the elections of Biſhops, we have ſeen from *Jerome* and *Eutychius*, how the Presbyters did chooſe the Biſhop. But in *Africk*, the Synod with the Clergy, and the people did it; of which we have a full account from *Cyprian, epiſt.* 68.

68. *De traditione divinâ & Apostolicâ observatione tenendum est, & observandum quod apud nos quoque, & fere per Provincias universas tenetur, ut ad ordinationes rite celebrandas, ad eam plebem cui præpositus ordinatur, Episcopi ejusdem Provinciæ proximi quique conveniant, & Episcopus delegatur plebe præsente, quæ singulorum vitam plenissime novit, & uniuscujusq; actum de ejus conversatione perspexerit.* And a little before, he saith, *Plebs ipsa maxime habet potestatem vel elegendi dignos Sacerdotes, vel indignos recusandi.* And from that of *Numb.* 10. where *Moses* stript *Aaron*, and clothed *Eleazer* before all the Congregation, he proves that it was of divine Authority, that the sacerdotal ordinations should not be, *nisi sub populi assistentis conscientiâ, ut plebe præsente, vel detegantur malorum crimina, vel bonorum merita prædicentur, & sit ordinatio justa & legitima, quæ omnium judicio & suffragio erit examinata.* And this course, he saith, held in the ordination both of Bishops, Priests and Deacons. And *Epist.* 33. he excuseth himself, that he had ordained one a Lector without the consent of his people, though he had been a Confessor in the persecution. the Epistle is directed to the Presbyters, Deacons, and the whole people, and begins: *In ordinationibus Clericis solemus vos ante consulere, & mores ac merita singulorum communi consilio ponderare.*

All

All that we meet with concerning this in Scripture, is the chusing of the Deacons by the people, *Acts* 6. for that of *Acts* 14.23. is clearly misapplied. 1 *Tim.* 3. a Deacon should be first approved, and *Titus* 1. 6. a Bishop must be ἀνεπίλημπτος; and thereby it appears, that certainly some enquiry was to be made into his Conversation, which at least must have been a Promulgation beforehand. So we find *Conc. Chalc. can.* 6. ὁ χειροτονούμενος ὑπογράφοντω. And *Lampridius* in the life of *Alexander Severus* tells, that he used such a course before he made any Governor of a Province. *Dicebatque grave esse non fieri in Provinciarum rectoribus, cum id Christiani & Judæi facerent in prædicandis Sacerdotibus, qui ordinandi sunt.*

But there were frequent disorders in these elections, which occasioned the 13. Canon of the Council of *Laodicea*, Περὶ τοῦ, μὴ τοῖς ὄχλοις ἐπιτρέπειν τὰς ἐκλογὰς ποιεῖσθαι τῶν μελλόντων καθίστασθαι εἰς ἱερατεῖαν: and by the Canon goeth before that, the election of Bishops is committed to the Bishops of the Province, which was also established by the Council of *Nice*, fourth and sixth Canon. Likewise *Justinian*, *Nov.* 123. *cap.* 1. excludes the people from the election of the Bishop, but leaves it to the Clergy, and the *primores Civitatis*, to name a list of three, out of which the *Metropolitan was to choose one.* The Bishops were to be ordained in the presence of the

the People, where every one might propose his exceptions, why he might not be ordained, which were to be examined before they proceeded to the Ordination. So *Conc. Antioch. Canon* 19. and *Carthag. Canon* 49. and *Justinian tit.* 1. *Nov. Const.* 1, 2. 17. according to *Photius in Nomocan, tit.* 1. *cap.* 8. Yet these popular elections were not wholly taken away, and at least the peoples consent was asked: but there were great disorders in these elections. *Nazianz. Orat.* 14. at his Father's Funeral instanceth them in two cases at *Cesarea*, where his Father was present; in which there were factions at the election of the Bishop: In one of them it was that *Basil* was chosen.

Ammian Mercellin tells what tumults were at *Rome* in the elections of their Bishops, of whom he saith, *Supra modum humanum ad rapiendam sedem Episcopalem ardebant*: So that at the election of *Damasus* the faction betwixt his electors, and those that were for *Ursicinus*, brake out into such a tumult, that there were *in Basilicâ Sicinini, ubi ritus Christiani est Conventiculum, centum triginta septem peremptorum cadavera reperta, lib.* 27. And he adds, It was no wonder they struggled so about it, because *id adepti futuri sunt ita securi, ut ditentur oblationibus matronarum, procedantque vehiculis insidentes, circumspecte vesti-ti, epulas curantes profusas, adeo ut eorum convivia*

Re-

Regales superent mensas, qui esse poterant beati revera, si urbis magnitudine despecta quam vitiis opponunt, ad imitationem quorundam provincialium Antistitum viverent, quos tenuitas edendi potandique parcissimè, vilitas etiam indumentorum & supercilia humum spectantia perpetuo Numini, verisque ejus cultoribus, ut puros commendant & verecundos.

Because of those disorders in elections, it was that *Nazianz. Orat.* 19. wished, that the elections were only or chiefly in their hands who served at their Altar. *Sit enim nunquam Ecclesiis male esset.* Therefore he desires they should no more be committed *iis qui opibus ac potentiâ pollent aut plebis impetui ac temeritati, atque etiam plebeiorum vilissimo aut contemptissimo cuique*, as had been before. Adding, that the disorders which were in such elections, made him loath his life, and long to be in a Wilderness.

One effect of these confused elections was, that some who were not Presbyters, nay not so much as Christians, were chosen Bishops: for *Orat.* 20. on *Basil*, when he tells how *Basil* was first ordained a Presbyter, he regrates that many Bishops oft-times leaped into the Chair without any preceding degree, which was contrary to Nature and Reason, since among Saylors none is made at first a Pilot: nor is there any at first made a General among Soldiers. *Nunc autem periculum est, ne ordo omnium sanctissimus, omnium*

omnium maximè ſit ridiculus: non enim virtute magis, quàm maleficio, & ſcelere Sacerdotium paratur, nec dignioruṁ, ſed potentiorum throni ſunt. Adding, that none is called a Phyſician, before he underſtand diſeaſes, nor a Painter before he can mix colors. *Antiſtes contra facile invenitur, non elaboratus, ſed recens.----Uno die ſancto fingimus, eoſque ſapientes & eruditos eſſe jubemus, qui nihil didicerunt: nec ad Sacerdotium quicquam prius contulerunt quam velle.* And *Orat.* 19. he tells how in *Ceſarea* at an election of a Biſhop, his Father and other Biſhops being preſent, there aroſe a great ſedition about it, which could not be eaſily compoſed, partly thorow the peoples fervor about the Faith, partly thorow the eminence of the Chair, which made the contentions greater. But at length the whole people with one conſent made choice of a perſon of great quality, but not yet baptized, to be their Biſhop: from which he was very averſe, but they took him by force, and by the aſſiſtance of ſome Soldiers then in the City, haled him to the Church, and deſired the Biſhops, not without threats, to ordain him: whereupon they overawed by fear and force, firſt purified him, and then ſet him upon the Throne; but more with their hands than with their heart. *Chryſoſt.* alſo *lib.* 3. *de Sacerdotio, cap,* 15. ſhews the evil of theſe popular elections, and that in them

them they looked more to riches and honor, than to true worth.

But where the Synodical elections were ſet up, the People were not wholly excluded from their intereſt in the choice, as we ſee particularly in the Churches of *Milan* and *Hippo*. Neither were theſe Synodical elections ſo regular as *Nazianzen* hoped, which appears from two famous Inſtances of *Nectarius* and *Ambroſius*.

Nectarius came to the Council of *Conſtantinople* in the company of *Diodorus* Biſhop of *Tarſus*: and then it was, that upon ſome differences (as you ſhall ſee afterwards) *Nazianzen* retired from *Conſtantinople*. And *Nectarius* thinking to go home to his Country, came to his Biſhop *Diodorus* to ask his bleſſing, and receive his commands. But at that time all *Diodorus* thoughts were, how a fit Perſon might be found for *Conſtantinople*, and looking on *Nectarius*, conſidering his Gravity, his gray Hairs, and ſweet Temper, he thought (it ſeems by a Divine Inſpiration) what if he were made Biſhop. And thereupon pretending another errand, he took him to the Biſhop of *Antioch*, and whiſpering him in the Ear, bid him conſider how fit a Perſon *Nectarius* might prove for the Biſhoprick of *Conſtantinople*. *Meletius* laughed in his heart at *Diodorus* his ſimplicity, who ſhould think

think of *Nectarius*, when ſo many famous Men had been named for that See by their Biſhops. After that, *Theodoſius* the Emperor commanded the Synod to give him in writing a liſt of ſuch perſons as were judged fit for that Chair, which being laid upon *Miletus* to draw, he to gratifie *Diodorus*, puts *Nectarius* among them. The Emperor at firſt reading began to think of *Nectarius*: but at ſecond reading, poſitively concluded that he muſt be the Biſhop. The Synod was amazed, and began to enquire about him, and found that he was but a *Catechumen*, whereupon they deſired the Emperour to change his mind; but he continuing reſolute, the Synod yielded: and after they had baptized him, they ordained him Biſhop. And by this we ſee that the Synod made the liſt, but the *Emperour* named the perſon.

Near of kin to this is the ſtory of *Ambroſe*. After *Auxentius* the Biſhop of *Milan* his death, *Valentinian* the Emperor called a Council of Biſhops, and appointed them to chuſe ſome holy and fit perſon to be Biſhop there, *Cujus authoritati & nos ſubjiciamur, cujuſq; reprehenſiones ferre non dubitemus. Etenim ut Imperatores nos ſimus, & rerum potiamur, homines tamen eſſe nos, & humanis lapſibus obnoxios fatendum nobis eſt.* But the Synod referred the Election back to him, that he might name the perſon, yet he refuſed it,

and told them, it was their buſineſs, adding, *Ego vero, id & viribus meis majus & ab officio meo alienum judico.* But as they went to conſult about this, the people of *Milan* did all run together to the Church to chuſe their Biſhops, ſome of them were *Arrians*, and others *Orthodox*, and each party was contending to have the Biſhop choſen of their own ſide. At that time *Ambroſe* a Noble *Roman* of the Conſular Order, was Prefect there, to whom *Valentinian*, when he ſent him to that charge, ſaid, *Vade, age non ut Judex, ſed ut Epiſcopus.* He fearing that the concourſe of the people might end in a Tumult, came among them to prevent that, and with great ſweetneſs exhorted them to calmneſs and unity; whereupon they much taken with his Speech, cryed out with one accord; *Let Ambroſe be Biſhop.* But he reſiſted this as much as he could, and did chide them for their indeliberate choice of a ſecular perſon, who was a ſtranger to Eccleſiaſtical affairs, and not ſo much as initiated into the faith, for he was not then baptized. Yet the Synod approving of their Election, he was firſt baptized, and then ordained Biſhop. But *Paulinus* adds, that after his Baptiſm, he paſt in order through all the Eccleſiaſtical degrees, and on the eighth day was ordained Biſhop there. Thus went the Synodical Elections: but it was a great while before that, even in the Elections of the

the Biſhops of *Rome*, the people were wholly barred from their priviledges. And of all this ſee at large *Antonius de Dominis, lib. 3. de Repub: Eccleſ. cap. 3.*

Metropolitans were choſen by the Patriarchs, and the Patriarchs by the Emperours: but in ſome caſes, the Emperours took the Elections ſimply to themſelves; at other times, they reſerved only the ratification of them to themſelves: and ſo for a great while, the Elections of the Biſhops of *Rome* were to be ratified, either by the Emperors of the *Eaſt*, or by their *Exarchs* at *Ravenna*. And after that *Charles the Great* aſſumed the Empire of the *Weſt*, it was decreed in a Synod at *Rome*, that the Election of the *Roman* Biſhop belonged to him: and accordingly he was in poſſeſſion of it, though his Succeſſors did ſimply ſlip from it. Now the Elections are in the hands of the Canons and Prebends, which is an art to make the Election go what way the Superior will. But the Chapters chuſing the Biſhop, was not known to the Ancients, it belonging to the whole College of the Presbyters without diſtinction. And all who deſire the reſtitution of Church diſcipline, think, that the erecting of Provincial Synods, and giving the power of electing Biſhops to them, is both the beſt method, and moſt agreeable to all Antiquity.

A See was not to lie vacant over three months, nor the ordination of a Bishop delayed, except upon an inexcusable necessity, otherwise the Metropolitan was liable to Censure, *Conc. Chalc. Can.* 25. and in the Council of *Sardice*, *Can.* 10. *Osius* proposed, that none should be Bishop till he had passed through all the inferior degrees, and had finished the Ministery of a Lector, Deacon, and Presbyter; and to this all the Bishops there present gave their consent: but by the instances already marked, we see that this order was not universally observed. *Nov.* 123. it is decreed, that a Bishop be at least three months among the Clergy, before he be ordained, that he may be instructed in the Ecclesiastical Ministery and service.

Another Custom there had been of Bishops ordaining Successors for themselves: so *Euseb. lib.* 7. *cap.* 26. or according to the *Greek* division, κεφ βλ. tells how *Theotecnus* Bishop of *Cesarea*, ordained *Anatolius* to be his Successor, and that for some time they were both Bishops together. In other places they did not ordain, but only design their Successors. Yet *Augustin* was ordained Bishop of *Hippo* by his Predecessor *Valerius*; but he apologizes for this, *Epist.* 110. and saith, that he did not know that it was contrary to the Council of *Nice*, which decreed that there should be but one Bishop at once in a City.

City. And from that Epistle we see it was ordinary for Bishops to design their Successors, which was done to prevent the tumults were usually in Elections. And *Augustin* tells us of a disorder which had been in a neighbor Town, because the Bishop, though he had designed his Successor, yet had not published it. Therefore he to evite that hazard, designed *Eradius* to be his Successor, to which all the people assented. Yet lest this might have opened a door for Bishops to have transmitted their Sees to their kindred or Friends, it was decreed in the Council of *Antioch*, *Can.* 23. that any such designation of Successors made by Bishops, should be declared null, and that the Election of the Bishop should be in the hands of the Bishops of that Synod where the See lay.

There might be but one Bishop in a City for Unities sake, yet sometimes there were Coadjutors: so *Nazianzen* was Coadjutor to his Father. And *Augustin* in his second Conference with the *Donatists*, offered that if the *Donatists* overcame, then they should yield their Bishopricks to them; but if the *Donatists* were overcome by them, and so should return to the community of the Church, they should admit them to be conjunct Bishops with them. So was the Schism in *Antioch* betwixt the *Meletianists* and the *Paulianists* setled, that both should be Bishops toge-

ther, and all should obey him that survived; to this they all agreed, confirming it by Oath. Yet *Flavianus*, one of *Miletus* his disciples, after his death, got himself chosen Bishop, but was in that condemned by all.

It is true, that the *Novatians* in divers Sees had distinct Bishops, but these were Schismaticks. Yet in the beginning of Christianity, it would appear that there were more Bishops in one place: for *Tertullian* and *Epiphanius* assert, that *Clemens* was ordained Bishop of *Rome* by S. *Peter*. And yet all reckon *Linus* to have succeeded him. So also *Evodius* is generally reckoned to be the first Bishop of *Antioch*; thus *Eusebius*, *Origen* and *Jerome*. Yet *Chrysostom* and *Theodoret* say, that *Ignatius* was ordained there by S. *Peter*. If there be any authority in *Clemens* his Constitutions, they offer a clear account of this, that *Evodius* was appointed Bishop of the Circumcision, and *Ignatius* Bishop of the Uncircumcision, and that after *Evodius*'s death, both Churches grew in one. The same also is applied to the difference about *Linus*, and *Clemens* by others, as if *Linus* had been Bishop of the Circumcision, and *Clemens* of the Uncircumcision; and that after *Cletus*'s death they all grew in one, and submitted to *Clemens*. However, it is clear that in every Church there was but one Bishop: and accordingly was decreed, *Conc. Nic.*

*Nic.Can.*8. Ἵνα μὴ ἐν τῇ πόλει δύο ἐπίσκοποι ὦσιν. By which ſtile we ſee they guarded againſt the diſorder of two Biſhops in a City, as a thing undoubtedly irregular, which hath been accounted ſo before that time: ſo that this of *one Biſhop in a City*, is not to be accounted an act of that Council; but a reference to ſome former act, or at leaſt an univerſally received practice. Yet the firſt ſucceſſion of the Biſhops of *Rome*, tho always perplexed, is much more ſo, from the moſt learned *Voſſius* (his Obſervations in his Letter to *Rivet*, ſubjoined to *Doctor Pearſon*'s *Vindiciæ of Ignatius his Epiſtles*:) who from all the Manuſcripts of *Damaſus* his *lives of the Popes*, informs us, that S. *Peter* did ordain both *Linus* and *Cletus* Biſhops of *Rome*: and after ſome enquiry into the matter, he concludes, that at firſt there were three Biſhops in *Rome* at once, *Linus*, *Cletus*, *Anencletus*. In the next Succeſſion, he places *Cletus*, *Anencletus* and *Clemens*; but *Anencletus* ſurviving both the other, ſate alone at *Rome*: after whom there was but one Biſhop there. Yet I know not if *Damaſus* ought to have ſuch authority, that upon his teſtimony we are bound to believe a thing ſo different from the accounts given by elder and more unqueſtioned Writers.

All *ambitus* was condemned in Biſhops; but it ſeems that in *Nazianzen*'s time it was too

common: For he in his Apologetick regrates how some περὶ ἄξιοι γινέσθαι προσιέναι τοῖς ἱεροῖς μεταπιοῦνται τοῦ βήματος, *tanquam non virtutis exemplum, sed victûs parandi occasionem & subsidium hunc ordinem esse judicantes: ac non munus referendis rationibus obnoxium, sed imperium ab omni censurâ immune.* And a little after: *Prius fere quam primam comam abjecerimus, pueriliq; more balbutire desierimus. — Si duo aut tria pia verba didicerimus, eaque non ex lectione, sed ex sola auditione hausta, aut Davidi paulum operæ dederimus, aut pallium scite contraxerimus, aut zonâ tenus philosophati fuerimus, pietatis quandam speciem nobis illinentes, ô præfecturam! ô elatum animum! Justinian. Const. Nov.* 137. *cap.* 1. complains, that *absque examinatione, atq; honestatis vitæ testimonio ordinantur Episcopi, Presbyteri, & Diaconi, &c.* And there divers places out of *Nazianzen*'s Apologetick are cited, to shew that Ordination should be gone about *cum omni diligentiâ atque rigore, Cad. de Epis. & Cler. leg.* 31. *Tantum ab ambitu debet esse sepositus, ut quæratur cogendus, rogatus recedat, invitatus effugiat, sola sibi suffragetur necessitas excusandi. Profecto enim est indignus Sacerdotio, nisi fuerit invitatus, invitus.*

Chrysostom in his third Book *de Sacerdotio, cap.* 10. among the qualifications of a Bishop, reckons for a chief one παντοχόθεν αὐτῷ τῆς τοῦ πράγματος ἐπιθυμίας καθαρεύειν δεῖ τὴν ψυχήν. *Nam*

si

si ad eum principatum adipiscendum vehementi animi affectu rapietur, eo adepto impotentiorem sane suæ ambitionis flammam incendet: ac vi tandem captus, ut sibi adeptum honorem stabiliat, nulli non peccato serviet: seu adulandum, seu servile quidpiam atque indignum sustinendum, seu res magno pecuniæ sumptu tentanda: nam quod nonnulli cædibus Ecclesias compleverint, contaminarintq; tum ejus honoris gratiâ depugnantes, civitates aliquot funditus everterunt dicere hic prætermitto, ne quibusdam videar ea in medium afferre quæ fide majora sunt. And to preoccupy the objection from 1 *Tim.* 1. 3. he adds, Ἐγὼ δὲ οὐ ἔργου, τῆς δὲ αὐθεντείας, καὶ δυναστείας ἐπιθυμεῖν εἶπον εἶναι δεινόν. And among other advantages of one who wants this too forward desire, he reckons this οὐδὲ τὴν καθαίρεσιν αὐτῆς δέδοικε. And with a great deal of ingenuity, he confesseth how strong that unlawful desire was in himself, which frighted him from entering in holy Orders.

How far *Nazianzen* was from all *ambitus*, the whole tract of his life doth fully discover. He was no sooner ordained a Presbyter, than he with his friend *Basile*, at that time likewise ordained, fled to *Pontus*, where they lived a great while, purifying their souls in the exercise of prayer and mortification. After which they returned home. *Nazianzen* out of compassion to his Father who pressed his return, and *Basile* out

out of zeal to Religion, and the Church then over-run with *Arrians*; S. *Baſile* by the means of old *Nazianzen*, was choſen and ordained Biſhop of *Ceſarea*, and he ordained *Nazianzen* Biſhop of *Saſime*: but he, what through his love of retirement, what becauſe *Saſime* being a ſtage of the Waggoners, was full of ſtirs and diſorders, immediately left that place, in which he was ſet againſt his heart. And ſome ſay that he never ordained any in it, nor conſecrated the Euchariſt while he was there: neither could ever his Father obtain of him to return to it. And when his Father dealt earneſtly with him, not without threatning of imprecations, that he would accept the charge of *Nazianzen* in his old age, he with great averſion yielded to his entreaty, declaring he would ſtay no longer there than his Father lived. During which time, he managed that See with a great deal of ſucceſs and applauſe: but after his Father died, which was in the hundred year of his age, he continued a little longer there, till his Mother who ſurvived her Husband ſometime, died alſo. And then he retired to a Houſe of holy Virgins in *Seleucia*, that in his abſence they might chuſe another Biſhop; but returning thither a little after, he found they had choſen none; yet he continued ſtiff as an Oak, and neither prayers nor tears could prevail with him. Afterward *Conſtantinople*

was

was in great diſorder through the Hereſies of *Apollinaris* and *Macedonius* lately ſprung up, beſide the *Arrian*, which was there before: and he being inwardly called of *God* to go thither, and prompted by his Friend *Baſile*, and invited by many Biſhops, and honourable Citizens, went and laboured among them: not behaving himſelf as their Biſhop, but as a temporary Overſeer. And though all the Churches were then poſſeſs'd by the Hereticks, none remaining for the Orthodox, ſave only *Anaſtaſia*; yet through his labours the face of affairs was quickly altered in *Conſtantinople*. When *Theodoſius* came to *Conſtantinople*, he poſſeſſed him of the great Church: and all the people deſired that he might be enthroned, the Emperour concurring with them in that: but he declined it: And though the Emperour took great pleaſure in him, yet he went ſeldom to the Palace. Then was the ſecond *General Council* called to *Conſtantinople*, and he was by the authority of *Miletus* Biſhop of *Antioch* (of whom we made mention before) confirmed in the Biſhoprick of *Conſtantinople* by the Council. But after this, there aroſe ſome contention by *Timotheus* Biſhop of *Alexandria*, who came later to the Council, and alledged upon the prerogative of his See, that that matter ſhould not have been decided without him. Upon this, hot and

ſharp

ſharp contentions aroſe among the Biſhops, not ſo much out of any diſpleaſure they had at *Nazianzen*, as out of their mutual jealouſies, though he that writes his life, ſaith, that this was occaſioned by *Miletus* his death. But therein he was miſtaken; for *Miletus* out-lived not only this action, and gave the liſt to *Theodoſius* of thoſe who were deſigned to ſucceed him (*Sozom. lib. 7. cap.* 8.) but he alſo out-lived the Council, and ſubſcribed its acts, and died a little after that in *Conſtantinople*. Upon this contention, *Nazianzen* finding many of thoſe who had before eſtabliſhed him, beginning to reſile, told them how at firſt he had refuſed that Government, tho the Church there had been by his labours and pains ſetled, and enlarged; but for that he expected his reward from *GOD*: yet it ſeemed ſtrange to him, that after he had been forced to accept of it, out of his love to the Flock, and preſſed to it with their united ſuffrages, they ſhould now think of undoing what themſelves had done. This he ſaid, not that he deſired Riches, or the nobleneſs of that Seat, and to be called *Biſhop of the Imperial City:* But he confeſſed, the loſs of his Children could not but affect him: beſides, he feared they might ſeem to proceed out of envy or lenity. However, if they deſired it, ἀλύπως τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς ἐξίσταμαι. — *Mihi quidem ſolitudo & olim chara fuit & nunc eſt:*

est: οὐ γὰρ θεοῦ εἴρξουσιν οἱ τὸν θρόνον ἀποστερήσοντες. Whereupon he went out, and retired from the house wherein he dwelt, to one more secret. But many of the people flocked about him, and with tears besought him to have compassion on them: yet he finding the dissention about him growing hotter among the Bishops, went again to the Council, and charged them by the holy Trinity, that they would compose their differences peaceably, adding: *But if I seem the occasion of any dissention among you, I am not more worthy than the Prophet* Jonas: *throw me in the sea, and these raging billows shall quickly be calmed, since I shall choose any thing you please, so if I be innocent, for drawing you to agreement on my account.* Θρόνου ἐξώσατε, πόλεως ἀπελάσατε· μόνον τὴν ὠλήθειαν καὶ τὴν εἰρενὴν ἀγαπήσατε· ἔρρωσθε ἱεροὶ ποιμένες. After which he went to the Emperor, and with great earnestness begged his permission to retire: which having obtained, he called the Clergy and people together, and with many tears took leave of them, charging them to continue stedfast in the faith. This being done, he retired to *Arianze*, a Village of *Cappadocia*, which belonged to him by inheritance, and continued in his retirement, giving himself to his Poetry, till he died in an old age.

That which next occurs to be considered is, in what places Bishopricks were founded, and

Bishops

Bishops setled. We find in all Cities where the Gospel was planted, and Churches constituted, that Bishops were also ordained. Among the *Jews*, where ever there were an hundred and twenty of them together, there did they erect a Synagogue. Compare with this *Acts* 1. 15. where the number of those that constituted the first Christian Church, is the same. So it is like where ever there was a competent number of Christians together, that a Church was there setled.

Yet in some Villages there were Churches and Bishops; so there was a Bishop in *Bethany*: And S. *Paul* tells of the Church of *Cenchrea*, which was the port of *Corinth*. It is true, some think that the Church of *Corinth* met there. So these of *Philippi* went out of the City by a River side to prayer, *Acts* 16. 13. But we find *Acts* 18. that there was a Synagogue in *Corinth*, and that S. *Paul* stayed in the House of *Justus*, near the Synagogue: and therefore there is no reason to think that the Christians should have had their meeting without the City, since there was no persecution then stirring: and neither in the *Acts*, nor in any of the *Epistles*, is there mention made of their going out to *Cenchrea*. Therefore it is probable that the Church of *Cenchrea* was distinct from *Corinth*: and since they had *Phebe* for their Deaconness, it is not to be doubted but

but they had both Biſhops and Deacons.

From the ſeveral Cities the Goſpel was dilated and propagated to the places round about. But in ſome Countries we find the Biſhopricks very thick ſet. They were pretty throng in *Africk*, for at a Conference which *Auguſtine* and the Biſhops of that Province had with the *Donatiſts*, there were of Biſhops two hundred eighty ſix preſent, and one hundred and twenty abſent, and ſixty Sees were then vacant, which make in all four hundred ſixty and ſix: There were alſo two hundred ſeventy nine of the *Donatiſts* Biſhops. *Sozom. lib. 7. hiſt. cap.* 19. ſpeaking how differently conſtituted ſome Churches were, he tells how in *Scythia*, though there were many Cities, yet there was but one Biſhop. But in other Nations there were Biſhops even in their Villages, as he knew to be among the *Arabians* and *Cyprians*. *Theodoret* tells, that there were eight hundred Pariſhes within his Dioceſe, *Epiſt.* 113. But it is to be obſerved, that in thoſe places where the Goſpel was lateſt of planting, the Biſhopricks are fewer, and conſequently larger. It is reported that in the vaſt tract of the *Abyſſin* Churches, there is one only Biſhop at *Abuna*. *Balſamon* on the 57. Canon of *Laodicea* tells, that at that time in ſome Churches of the *Eaſt*, it was neither ſafe nor expedient for them to have Biſhops: and they were

ſup-

ſupplied by Viſiters, ſent them from other Biſhops, ſo that they had no Biſhops of their own: which was occaſioned both by their poverty, and the ſmalneſs of their number, yet they were under the care and charge of other Biſhops. Some Churches lay long vacant and without Biſhops. In *Carthage*, when *Hunnerick* invaded them, they wanted a Biſhop twenty four years: and he offering them one, providing the *Arrians* might have the free exerciſe of their Religion among them; they anſwered, that upon theſe terms *Eccleſia non delectatur Epiſcopum habere*, ſo *Victor lib. 2. perſ. Vand.* When *Miletus* was driven out of *Antioch*, for ten years together *Diodorus* and *Flavian* two Preſbyters ruled that Church, *Theodor. lib. 4. hiſt. cap. 23.* Some places are alledged to have had the Goſpel long before there were Biſhops among them, and particularly *Scotland*, for *Major lib. 2. cap. 2.* ſaith, *per Sacerdotes & Monachos, ſine Epiſcopis Scoti in fide eruditi erant.* The time of our converſion to the faith is reckoned to have been *An. 263.* And *Palladius* reckoned the firſt Biſhop came not for an hundred and ſeventy years after that in the year 430. *Fordown* in his *Chronicle, lib. 3. cap. 8.* ſaith, *Ante Palladii adventum habebant Scoti fidei Doctores, & Sacramentorum adminiſtratores, Presbyteros ſolum, vel Monachos ritum ſequentes Eccleſiæ primitivæ.*

Theſe

Theſe were called *Culdes*, though in ſome Bulls they be *Celli Dei*. *Boethius* thinks it is *Culdei*, *quaſi cultores Dei:* but others judg that it is from the Cells wherein they lived, which were held in great eſteem, and after their death were turned into Churches: and from thence they think the name *Kil* is to this day ſo much uſed, as *Kilpatrick*, *Kilmarnock*, *Kilbride*, &c. Of theſe *Boethius* ſaith, That by common ſuffrage, they made choice of one of their number to be chief over them, who was called *Epiſcopus Scotorum*: ſo *lib. 6. fol.* 92. This is contradicted by *Buchanan lib.* 5. who ſaith, That before *Palladius* his coming, *Eccleſiæ abſque Epiſcopis per Monachos regebantur, minori quidem cum faſtu, & externâ pompâ, ſed majore ſimplicitate & ſanctimoniâ.* But all our old Manuſcripts being gone, it will not be eaſie to come to a deciſion about this matter. The *Gothick* Churches are ſaid to have been planted and conſtituted before *Ulphilas* their firſt Biſhop came unto them for ſeventy years together.

In the beginning the Biſhop's whole charge was called παροικία, and by the ſtrain of *Ignatius* his Epiſtles, eſpecially that to *Smyrna*, it would appear, that there was but one Church, at leaſt but one place, where there was one Altar and Communion in each of theſe Pariſhes: for he ſaith, There was one Biſhop, one Church, and

one Altar. And *Cyprian* phraſeth the erecting of a Schiſm, by the erecting of an Altar againſt an Altar: which ſeems to import, that there was but one Altar in the Biſhops Pariſh. While the number of the Chriſtians was but ſmall, they might well have all met together in one place; but as they increaſed, and the perſecutions grew upon them, they muſt have had ſeveral meeting places, and conſequently ſeveral perſons to preſide and officiate in theſe meetings. But *Damaſus* and *Platina* reckon, that *Evariſtus* who was Biſhop of *Rome* about the 106. year, was the firſt, *qui titulos in urbe Româ Presbyteris diviſit*: ſo that before his time, the Presbyters have all officiated here or there indefinitely according to the Biſhop's appointment. And *Evariſtus* ſeems to have given them aſſignments to particular places. As for the meaning of the word *Tituli*, it is to be conſidered that the Chriſtians met about the places where the Martyrs were buried, and ſo their meeting places were called *Memoriæ Martyrum*. Now upon Burials ſome title or inſcription being uſually made, it followed that the place of the burial or Graveſtone was called *Titulus* among the *Latins*: ſo *Gen.* 35.20. *Jacob*'s erecting a Pillar upon *Rachels* Grave, is rendred by the vulgar *Latin*, *erexit titulum ſuper ſepulchrum*: and *Gen.* 28.18. of *Jacob*'s ſtone at *Bethel*, it is ſaid, *erexit in titulum*, and 2 *Sam.* 18.

18.

18. *Absalom* his Pillar is called *Titulus*: Hence it is that *Evaristus* his dividing of the titles is to be understood of his giving particular assignments of several Churches to Presbyters.

The next thing to be examined is, what were the actions appropriated to Bishops. If we believe *Jerome*, the Bishop did nothing which Presbyters might not do, except Ordination: By which we see, that he judged Ordination could not be done without the Bishop. *Athanasius* in his second *Apology* inserts among other papers, an Epistle of the *Synod* of *Alexandria*, mentioning that *Ischyras* his Ordination by *Colluthus* being questioned and examined, and it being found that *Colluthus* had never been ordained a Bishop, but that he had falsly pretended to that Title and Character, all the Ordinations made by him were annulled: and *Ischyras* with such others who were so ordained, were declared Laicks. Which is an undeniable instance, that at that time, it was the general sense of the Church, that none but a Bishop might ordain. Neither in any Author do we meet with an instance of any that were ordained by Presbyters, save one, that *Cassian*, who was about the 500. year, *Collat.* 4. *cap.* 1. gives of one *Paphnutius* a Presbyter in the Desert of *Scetis*, who delighting in the Vertues of one *Daniel*, *ut quem vitæ meritis & gratiâ sibi parem noverat, coæquare sibi*

etiam Sacerdotii ordine festinaret. — *Eum Presbyterii honori provexit.* But what a few devout solitaries might do in a desert and undiscerned corner, will be no precedent for a constituted Church: else we may allow of Baptism with sand, for that was once done in a Desert.

But *Socrates* had another Opinion of this, who *lib.* 1. *cap.* 27. tells, that *Ischyras* did a thing πολλῶν θανατῶν ἄξιον, εἰδὲ πώποτε γὰρ ἱερωσύνης τυχὼν τὸ τῦ πρεσβυτέρυ ὄνομα ἑαυτῷ περιθέμενος. And in the third Council of *Toledo*, set down by *Gratian*, *dist.* 23. *cap.* 14. this Canon was made. *Quorundam Clericorum dum unus ad Presbyterium duo ad Levitarum ministerium sacrarentur, Episcopus oculorum dolore detentus, fertur manum suam super eos tantum imposuisse, & Presbyter quidam illis contra Ecclesiasticum ordinem benedictionem dedisse, sed quia jam ille examini divino relictus, humano judicio accusari non potest, ii qui supersunt gradum Sacerdotii vel Levitici ordinis quem perverse adepti sunt, amittant.* By which we see how far they were from allowing of any Ordination, wherein a Bishop had not intervened.

It is further clear, that the Bishop was looked upon as the Pastor of the Flock, who was πεπιστευμένος τὸν λαὸν τῦ θεῦ, and that Presbyters or Deacons could finish nothing, ἄνευ γνώμης ἐπισκόπυ, and that he was to give an account of the Souls of the people: and indeed in these days

days a Biſhoprick was *onus* more than *honos*. The common treaſury of the Church was alſo committed to his care, ſo *infra Can.* 4. And as the Offerings of the faithful were laid down at the Apoſtles feet, *Acts* 4.34. ſo were the *collectæ*, and the other goods of the Church laid in their hands. For all the goods of the Church and *collectæ*, were at firſt depoſited in the Biſhop's hand, and diſtributed by him, tho afterwards there was an *OEconomus* appointed for that work.

Ignatius Epiſt. ad Magneſ. tells, that they were to do nothing without their Biſhop. And *ad Smyrn.* μηδὲὶς χωρὶς ὀπισκόπε τι πρασσέτω τῶν ἀνηκόντων εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν. And 5. Canon of *Laodicea*, they might no nothing, ἄνευ γνώμης ἐπισκόπε. *Idem. Can.* 19. *Arel.* 1.

As for Baptiſm, *Tertull. de bapt.* ſaith, *Dandi quidem jus habet ſummus Sacerdos, qui & Epiſcopus, dehinc Presbyteri & Diaconi, non quidem ſine Epiſcopi authoritate, propter Eccleſiæ bonum, quo ſalvo ſalva pax eſt, alioquin laicis etiam jus eſt. Firmilian ad Cyprianum*, which is reckoned the 75. among *Cyprian* his *Epiſtles*, ſaith, *Majores natu* (and by what is a little after, where he calls theſe Biſhops, it is clear he means not of Preſbyters) *in Eccleſiâ præſidebant, & baptizandi, & manum imponendi, & ordinandi, poteſtatem poſſidebant. Pacian. ſerm. de Bapt. Lavacro peccata*

purgantur, Chrismate spiritus super funditur, utraq; vero ista manu & ore Antistitis impetramus. And even *Jerome* himself *contra Luciferianos*, saith, *Sine Chrismate & Episcopi jussione, neque Presbyter, neque Diaconus jus habent baptizandi.* By all which we see, that Baptism was chiefly the Bishop's work, and that the Presbyters did not baptize without his order.

As for the Eucharist, *Ignatius ad Smyrnenses*, saith, ἐκεῖνη βεβαία εὐχαριστία ἡγείσθω, ἡ ὑπὸ ἐπισκοπον οὖσα, ἢ ᾧ ἄν αὐτὸς ἐπιτρέψῃ And a little after ἐξὸν ἐστὶν χωρὶς ἐπισκόπου βαπτίζειν οὔτε ἀγάπην ποιεῖν. *Justin* in his second *Apol.* giving the account of their Eucharist and whole service, reckons all to have been managed by the προεστῶς. And *Tert. de cor. mil. Non de aliorum quam præsidentium manibus sumimus.* But all this is very unjustly applied by such as would pretend to the whole Ecclesiastical Authority; but would exempt themselves from the great labor of it. For it is clear, that according to the primitive constitution, the Bishop was the immediate Pastor of the flock, and the Presbyters were assumed by him *in partem sollicitudinis*: the greatest of the load still lying on his own shoulders, and this might have been some way managed by him, where the Dioceses were smaller. But the enlarging of the Dioceses hath wholly altered the figure of Primitive Episcopacy. All that the Bishop

shop can now do being to try entrants well, and overlee these that are in charge; which ought not to be performed either by these overly visitations in Synods, or by a pompous procession through the Diocese, but by a strict and severe Examen both of their lives and labors, performed in such visitations, as are sutable to the simplicity and humility of the Gospel.

As for Preaching, it was ordinary at first, even for persons not ordained to preach, not to mention that of the *Corinthians*, where *every one brought his Psalm, his interpretation, or his doctrine to the Meeting*, which may be called Extraordinary; under which notion, most reject every thing in Scripture that doth not please them. But this continued longer in the Church. *Euseb. lib. 6. hist. cap.* 20. tells, that *Origen* before he had gotten the χειροτονίαν τῦ πρεσβυτερίυ (mark how this word stands here for the order and degree of Presbyterat) was invited earnestly by the Bishops not only to dispute, but also to expound the Scriptures, ἐν τῇ κοινῇ τῆς ἐκκλησίας· *In the publick assembly of the Church.* For the vindication whereof *Alexander* Bishop of *Jerusalem*, and *Theoctistus* Bishop of *Cesarea*, wrote to *Demetrius* Bishop of *Alexandria* thus: *Quod autem in literis adjunxeris nunquam antea auditum, neque jam usurpatum, ut Laici præsentibus Episcopis disputarent, scripturásve exponerent in eo mihi, nescio quo modo,*

videris falſa dixiſſe: Nam ubi idonei & habiles reperiuntur, qui fratribus in verbo DEI adjumento ſint, à ſanctis Epiſcopis rogantur, ut populum DEI inſtituant in verbo, ſicut Larandis Euelpis à Neone, Iconii Paulinus à Celſo, & apud Synadas Theodorus ab Attico, qui omnes beati ac pii fratres erant: ac veriſimile eſt, quamvis nobis obſcurum & minime cognitum ſit, illud idem in aliis locis fieri. *Tert.* in his *Apologetick cap.* 39. tells, that *Poſt aquam manualem & lumina, quiſquis ut de Scripturis ſanctis, vel de proprio ingenio poteſt provocatur in medium DEO hymnum canere.* And of this remember what was before cited from *Hilary* the Deacon on the 4th of the *Epheſians*. *Sozom. lib* 7. *cap.* 19. ſaith, that at *Rome* neither the Biſhop, nor any other taught in the Church: but that in *Alexandria* the Biſhop alone taught, that not being allowed to any Presbyter, after *Arrius* broached his Hereſie.

It remains only to be enquired who was the proper Miniſter of Confirmation. But becauſe this whole matter of Confirmation comes not in ſo properly upon any of the other Canons, I ſhall therefore examine all that relates to it here, and ſhall conſider upon what grounds it was uſed, how early it was practiced, with what Rites it was adminiſtred, who was the proper Miniſter of it, and for what end it was introduced, and continued in the Church.

From

From *Acts* 8. 15. and 19. 6. all the Fathers have pleaded for this Rite: for there we have the laying on of hands practiced, as a Rite clearly diſtinct from Baptiſm: and tho we find the holy Ghoſt conferred by that impoſition of hands, thence it will not follow that that action was extraordinary, and ſo to have expired with the Apoſtles: For we find extraordinary effects following upon their ordinary actions, ſuch as Ordination, Excommunication, *&c.* And yet none will plead that theſe actions are now to be diſuſed, becauſe they are no more attended with ſuch effects. But *Heb.* 6. 2. ſpeaks moſt plainly for this, where among the foundations of Religion, the laying on of hands is joined with Baptiſms: and this ſeemed ſo clear to *Calvin* commenting on that place, that he judges this to have been a Rite derived from the Apoſtles.

The conſtant Ceremony of it was that which is often mentioned in Scripture, *Impoſition of hands.* But beſides this, they began very early to uſe a *Chriſma* of conſecrated Oil, with which they anointed them in the brow. This it ſeems hath been taken from the mention that we find made of anointing, 2 *Cor.* 1. 21. where ſome think the whole Rites of Confirmation are ſet down in theſe words: *Now he which ſtabliſheth us with you in* CHRIST, *and hath anointed us, is*

GOD

GOD, who hath also sealed us, and given us the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts. And 1 *Joh.*2.27. we are told of *an unction from above*, and *a holy anointing*. But that in these words no material anointing, but the extraordinary conferring of the holy Ghost is meant, seems clear from the Text: and so *Christ* is said to be *anointed with the Oil of joy above his fellows*, tho we hear nothing of a material anointing. It is true, *James* 5. 14. there is clear mention made of an anointing with Oil, in which certainly there is no Metaphor, but that relates nothing to our purpose. However, it is like from these places it was that the Ancients used the *Chrisma*, for we find that this was very early practised in the Church.

Theophilus Alexandrinus, who flourished about the year 170. *lib.*1. *ad Antolycum*, saith, we are for this reason called *Christians*, ὅτι χριόμεθα ἔλαιον τῦ θεῦ. *Et quis mortalium est, qui vel ingreditur in hanc vitam, vel certat in arenâ & non oleo inungitur. Iren. lib.* 1. *cap.*18. tells, That *Valentinus* used both *Confirmation and anointing in the receiving of his Disciples*, and tells, that *he used a mixture of Water and Oil with Opobalsamum*. And this seems to imply that to have been the practice of the Church; for he tells, that *Valentinus* had adapted and transformed the Rites of the Church into his Character. *Tert. de bapt. cap.* 7. makes mention of the *Unctio benedicta*,

qua

quæ egressi de lavacro perunguntur. And *cap.* 8. *dehinc manus imponitur per benedictionem advocans & invitans Spiritum Sanctum, Idem de resur. carnis, cap.* 8. saith, *Caro abluitur* —— *caro ungitur* — *caro signatur, caro manus impositione adumbratur, ut & anima spiritu illuminetur.* And *lib. de præscript. cap.* 36. *Aquâ signat, Spiritu sancto vestit, Eucharistiâ pascit.* Yet *Tert. de Cor. Mil. cap.* 3. when he recounts these Ceremonies which he judged to have been of Apostolical tradition, doth not reckon this for one.

Cyprian Epist. 73. *ad Jubaianum,* speaking of S. *Peter* and S. *John* their laying on of hands at *Samaria,* shews it was no new Baptism: *Sed tantummodo quod deerat id à Petro & Joanne factum esse, ut oratione pro iis habitâ, ac manu impositâ, invocaretur & infunderetur super eos Spiritus sanctus: quod nunc quoque apud nos geritur, ut qui in Ecclesiâ baptizantur præpositis Ecclesiæ offerantur, & per nostram orationem & manus impositionem Spiritum sanctum consequantur, & signaculo divino consummentur.* And *Epist.* 70. after he hath spoken of Baptism, he adds, *Ungi quoque necesse est eum qui baptizatus sit, ut accepto Chrismate id est unctione esse unctus Dei, & habere in se gratiam Christi possit.* And he tell, That both the Eucharist & *oleum unde unguntur babtizati, in altari sanctificatur. Cyril* of *Jerusalem his third Mistagogical Catechism* is, *περὶ χρίσματος,* wherein he describes

the

the anointing we have from GOD; and the conſecrated Oil, which was the rite expreſſive of the former, comparing it to the Dove that deſcended from *Chriſt*, and was his ſpiritual Anointing. Which is alſo done by *Optatus*, *lib.* 4. *cont. Parmenianum*, and the *Areopagite de Eccleſ. hier. cap.* 4. where he at length deſcribes the rites uſed in the conſecrating of the *Chriſma*. Yet this *Chriſma* was not ſo peculiar to Confirmation, but that it was alſo uſed upon other occaſions. *Nazianzen* tells (as is above cited) that ſuch as were ordained, were alſo anointed. It was alſo uſed in Baptiſm, ſo both *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, and *Jerome*, and the 48. *Canon* of the Council of *Laodicea* decrees, that the *Illuminati poſt baptiſma* ſhould be anointed with this *unguentum cœleſte*. But by the 1. *Can.* of the Council of *Orange*, it was decreed, *That he who was not anointed at Baptiſm, ſhould receive the Chriſma at his Confirmation:* by which it ſeems they did not repeat the ceremony of Anointing, to ſuch as had received it at Baptiſm.

Likewiſe theſe who returned from Hereſie, by the 7. *Can.* of the ſecond *General Council* were to be anointed *& fronte, & oculis, & naribus, & ore, & auribus, & ſignantes eos dicimus donum Spiritus ſancti.* And like unto this is the 7. *Can.* of *Laodicea*. And *Author Reſp. ad Orthod.* that goeth under *Juſtin*'s name, *ad quæſt.* 14. *Cum hæreticus*

reticus ad veram fidem accedit, corrigitur lapsus falsæ opinionis, sententiæ mutatione: baptismi, sancti Chrismatis unctione; ordinationis, manum impositione: nihilque quod prius erat, indissolutum manet. Now by this χειροθεσία, which he mentions, is not meant a new Ordination, which was not given to those that returned from Heresie. For as appears by the Council of *Nice*, the Orders which they got among the Hereticks were held valid, and not to be renewed: but this is meant of the Ceremony ordinarily given in the absolution and receiving of Penitents. *August. cont. Donatist. lib.* 5. *cap.* 23. confesseth, that the Baptism of Hereticks was valid, but denies that they conferred the holy Ghost, and therefore imposition of hands was given to those who returned from Heresie.

Besides this *Chrisma*, they used also in Confirmation the sign of the Cross, of which that phrase of *Tertullian* is to be understood *caro signatur*. And *Aug. in Psal.* 141. speaking of the Sacraments, saith, *Quædam sicut nostri ore accipimus, quædam per totum corpus.* And a little after, *tegat frontem crux Domini*, which words are to be understood of the Eucharist, Baptism and Confirmation. He calls this also *Sacramentum Chrismatis, lib.* 2. *cont. Petilianum, cap.* 104. applying to it that of the Ointment on *Aaron*'s beard, *Psalm* 133. But elsewhere he calls that Bread which

which was bleſt, not with the Euchariſtical and Sacramental benediction, but with that lower degree, called *Eulogy*, which might be given to the Catechumens, *Sacramentum Catechumenorum*; uſing this term largely, as he ſaith *Epiſt. ad Marcellinum. Signum cum ad rem ſacram applicatur, Sacramentum appellatur.* Of this ſign of the Croſs, is likewiſe to be underſtood that of the *Signaculum Dominicum*, mentioned by *Cyprian, Ep.* 73.

The next thing to be enquired after is, who was the Miniſter of Confirmation? In the *Weſtern* Church the Biſhop did only adminiſter it. So *Jerome adv. Lucifer ianos*, brings in the Luciferian in the Dialogue. *An neſcis Eccleſiarum hunc morem eſſe, ut baptizatis poſtea manus imponantur, & ita invocetur Spiritus ſanctus? Exigis ubi ſcriptum eſt? In Actibus Apoſtolorum. Etiamſi Scripturæ authoritas non ſubeſſet, totius orbis hanc in partem conſenſus, inſtar præcepti obtineret.* Then he makes the Orthodox to anſwer: *Non equidem abnuo hanc eſſe Eccleſiarum conſuetudinem, ut ad eos qui longe in minoribus urbibus per Presbyteros & Diaconos baptizati ſunt, Epiſcopus ad invocationem Sancti Spiritus excurrat.* And asking why the holy Ghoſt was not given, but by the Biſhop? He anſwers, That was *potius ad honorem Sacerdotii, quam ad legis neceſſitatem. Aug. de Trin. lib.* 15. *cap.* 16. ſpeaking of the Apoſtles conferring of the holy Ghoſt, ſaith, *Orabant, ut veniret Spiritus ſanctus*

ctus in eos quibus manum imponebant, non enim ipſi eum dabant, quem morem in ſuis præpoſitis etiam nunc ſervat Eccleſia.

But in the *Greek* Church, Presbyters might confirm: ſo the above cited *Hilary* on the 4 of the *Epheſ. Deniq; apud Ægyptum Presbyteri conſignant, ubi præſens non ſit Epiſcopus:* and *lib. quæſt. in Vet. & Nov. Teſt.* called *Auguſtin's*, but believed to be the ſame *Hilary's*, *quæſt.* 101. ſaith, *In Alexandriâ, & per totam Ægyptum ſi deſit Epiſcopus conſecrat Presbyter.* By the comparing of which places, it appears, that it is the ſame thing which is expreſt by theſe various names of *Conſecration* and *Conſignation:* but what is meant by it, is not agreed to. It is abſurd to think that Ordination can be meant by it. For that deciſion of the caſe of *Iſchyras* ſhews that in *Alexandria* they were far from allowing Presbyters to ordain without a Biſhop. Some think that becauſe *Conſecration* is more uſually applied to the bleſſing of the Euchariſt; therefore both it and *Conſignation*, is ſo to be underſtood here. And whereas it is objected that in the cited places ſome cuſtom peculiar to *Alexandria* ſeems to be mentioned; but it was univerſally allowed in the Biſhop's abſence for the Presbyter to conſecrate the Euchariſt: therefore ſome other thing muſt be there meant. It is anſwered to this, that in other places Presbyters might not conſecrate *ſine Epiſcopi juſſione*; according

ing

ing to what was cited out of *Ignatius*; and that the cuſtom in *Alexandria* hath been, that the Presbyters without any ſuch expreſs Mandate, might have conſecrated in the Biſhop's abſence. But the general practice of the *Greek* Church inclines me to think, that *Confirmation* is meant by the cited places, which was uſually phraſed by *Conſignation* σφραγὶς, or σφράγισμος, only the conſecrating af the *Chriſma* and Oil, was peculiar to the Biſhop, as his work; ſo that the *Greeks* ſeem to have made a difference betwixt the hallowing and applying of the *Chriſma*. The firſt could only be done by the Biſhop, but the ſecond was not denied to the Presbyters. Even as in the Euchariſt none might conſecrate but Presbyters,, yet Laicks of both Sexes, in caſe of neceſſity, might have carried and given it to the abſents.

Of Confirmation adminiſtred by Presbyters, ſome inſtances do meet us in the *Latin* Church. The firſt Canon of the Council of *Orange*, permits the uſe of the *Chriſma* to the Prieſts, who are appointed to carry ſome of it always about with them. *Conc. Epaunenſe, cap.* 16. permits the Presbyters to give the *Chriſma* to ſuch Hereticks as were converted on their death-beds. And the ſecond Canon of the Council of *Orange* is: *Hæreticos in mortis diſcrimine poſitos, ſi Catholici eſſe deſiderant, ſi Epiſcopus deſit, à Presbyteris cum Chriſmate & benedictione conſignari placuit.* And the

the Council of *Toledo* permits a Presbyter to do it in the Biſhops abſence, or in his preſence, if commanded by him. But both *Eaſt* and *Weſt*, it was agreed, that the *Chriſma* could not be ſanctified by Presbyters. *Conc. Romanum ſub Sylv. cap.* 5. decreed it. But as that Council is much ſuſpected, ſo the reaſon there given is a very poor one. *Quia Chriſtus dicitur à Chriſmate.* But Canon ſixth, *Cod. Afric.* is more authentick, *ut Chriſma à Presbyteris non fiat.* And Synod *Tolet. Can.* 20. *Quamvis pene ubique cuſtodiatur ut abſq; Epiſcopo nemo Chriſma conficiat, tamen quia in aliquibus locis vel Provinciis dicuntur Presbyteri Chriſma conficere, placuit ex hoc die nullum alium niſi Epiſcopum hoc facere.* And the *Areopagite*, as he at length deſcribes it, and deſcants upon it, ſo he appropriates it to the Biſhop.

Gregory the Great, lib. 3. *Epiſt* 9. writing to *Januarius* Biſhop of *Caralis* in *Sardinia*, diſcharges Presbyters to anoint with the *Chriſma* on the brow, appointing that to be reſerved to the Biſhop: for *Sardinia*, and the other Iſles, had obſerved the cuſtoms of the *Greek* Church: but *Gregory Epiſt.* 26. writing to that ſame perſon, tells, that he heard how ſome were ſcandalized, becauſe he had diſcharged Presbyters the uſe of the *Chriſma*, which he therefore takes off in theſe words: *Et nos quidem ſecundum uſum veterem Eccleſiæ noſtræ fecimus, ſed ſi omnino hac de re*

aliqui contristantur, ubi Episcopi desunt, ut Presbyteri etiam in frontibus baptizatos Chrismate tangere debeant concedimus.

But 200 years afterwards, *Nicolaus* first Bishop of *Rome*, observed not that moderation. For the *Bulgarians* who were converted by the *Greeks*, receiving the *Chrisma* from the Presbyters according to the custom of that Church; *Nicolaus* sent Bishops to them, and appointed such as had been confirmed by Presbyters to be confirmed again by Bishops. But upon this, *Photius*, who was then Patriarch of *Constantinople*, called a *Synod*, in which it was decreed, that the *Chrisma* being hallowed by a Bishop, might be administred by Presbyters. And *Photius* in his Epistle contends, that a Presbyter might, *unguento signare, sanctificare, consummatos augere, & expiatorium donum baptizato consummare*, as well as he might either baptize or offer at the Altar. But *Nicolaus* impudently denied, that this had ever been permitted, and upon this account it is, that many of the *Latins* have charged the *Greek* Church, as if there were no Confirmation used among them. But this challenge is denied and rejected by the *Greeks*. And so much of the Minister of Confirmation.

It is in the last place to be considered, what value was set upon this action, and for what ends it was practised in the Church. We have already

dy heard *Augustin* call it a *Sacrament*. It is likewise so termed by *Cyprian Epist.* 72. and in the Records of the Council held by him for the rebaptizing of Hereticks. But as was marked before, they took that term largely for an holy rite or symbolical action: Whereas a Sacrament strictly taken is a holy rite instituted by *Christ* for a federal stipulation, by which the promises of the Gospel are sealed, and grace conveyed to the worthy receivers. Now in this sense it is visible, that Confirmation is no Sacrament: it neither being instituted by Christ, nor having any grace appended to it. Neither is it so totally distinct from Baptism, being but a renovation of the baptismal Vow, joined with Prayer, and a solemn benediction.

Some have thought, that Confirmation was only used by the Ancients, as an appendix, or a consummatory rite of Baptism, which mistake is founded upon this, that some of the riper age being baptized, got this imposition of hands after Baptism. For the clearing of which some things must be considered: First, The Ancients used an imposition of hands before Baptism, to such as were admitted to be *Catechumens*, who were in the Christian Church, like the *Proselytes* of the gates among the *Jews*: for they having renounced Idolatry, were admitted to some parts of the Christian worship, and instru-

cted in the faith for some time, before they could commence Christians. And an imposition of hands was used, when any were admitted to this Order: so it is express in the 39. Canon of *Elib.* and in the *Greek Euchology* there is a prayer εἰς τὸ ποιῆσαι τὸν κατηχούμενον. Where it is said, *Inflat signat & manum imponit.* And in the Liturgy called S. *Marks*, *Quotquot ad Baptismum dispositi estis accedite, ac manus impositionem & benedictionem accipite, dein manum imponit Sacerdos.* And *Euseb. de vita Const. lib.* 4. saith of *Constantine*; *Confessione factâ precum particeps factus est per impositionem manuum.* The *Areopagite* makes mention also of this as done twice before Baptism; and *Aug. de mer. & remis. pec. lib.*2.*cap.*26. *Catechumenum secundum quendam modum suum per signum & orationem manuum impositionis puto sanctificari.* And *Cyprian ad Steph.* makes Baptism a superaddition to that imposition of hands: which he draws from the example of *Cornelius*, upon whom the Spirit falling first, he was afterward baptized. It is true, he is there speaking of such as turned from Heresie, who he judged should be rebaptized, after an imposition of hands first given them.

But as the 39. Canon of *Elib.* speaks of an imposition of hands given before Baptism, so the 7. Canon of that same Council, mentions another given after it. *Si quis Diaconus regens plebem*

sine

ſine Epiſcopo, vel Presbyteris, aliquos baptizaverit, eos per benedictionem perficere debebit. And by the 33. Canon of that Council, any Laick that was baptized, and was no *Bigamus*, might baptize a *Catechumen* if ſick. *Ita ut ſi ſupervixerit, ad Epiſcopum cum perducat, ut per manus impoſitionem perficere* (or as others read it *perfici*) *poſſit.* If the firſt be the reading, it will relate to Confirmation; if the ſecond, it will relate to the compleating of the Baptiſm.

The 48. Canon of *Laodicea* is, *Illuminatos poſt baptiſma unguento cœleſti liniendos eſſe.* To infer from that, that Confirmation was immediately to follow upon Baptiſm is, λειτολογεῖν, for μετὰ τὸ βαπτίσμα, doth not imply that it was to be done immediately after, but only that Baptiſm was to go before it: and we find that ſame phraſe in the Canons immediately preceding this, applied to ſuch as had been of a great while baptized. But tho ſuch as were of riper years had been confirmed immediately after they received Baptiſm, it will no more prove that Confirmation was an appendix of Baptiſm, than that the Euchariſt was ſo likewiſe, which was alſo given to them at the ſame time. So the *Areopagite* tells, how ſuch as were baptized, were carried by the Prieſt to the Biſhop. *Ille vero unguento conſecrato virum ungens ſacroſanctæ Euchariſtiæ participem eſſe pronunciat.* And tho

even Children were confirmed immediately after Baptism, that doth not prove the one but a rite of the other: for we find that not only in the *African* Churches, but also in the *Roman* Church, the custom of giving Children the Eucharist immediately after Baptism, continued long: for the *Ordo Romanus*, held by some a work of the eleventh Century, appoints, that Children be permitted to eat nothing after they are baptized, till they received the Eucharist. That same practice is also mentioned by *Hugo* the *S. Victore*, *lib.* 1. *cap.* 20. in the twelfth Century. And all the *Greek* Writers assert the necessity of Childrens receiving the Eucharist, and yet none asserted the Eucharist to be but a rite of Baptism. *Cornelius* tells of *Novatian* (*apud Eusebium*, *lib.* 6. *hist. cap.* 35.) how he was baptized *Clinicus*, and being recovered *nec reliquorum particeps factus, quæ secundum Canones Ecclesiæ obtinere debuerat, nec ab Episcopo obsignatus est.* (It is true, it is in the *Greek* τῆς σφραγισθῆναι, as if it were explicative of the τὰ λοιπὰ, which in the former words he said he wanted; whence some infer, that Confirmation was but one of the Baptismal rites. But it is clear that the true reading is ὑπὸ, and so *Nicephorus* hath read it) *quo non impetrato, quomodo Spiritum sanctum obtinuisse putandus est.* Yet from the Story it appears that Confirmation was judged only necessary

ad

ad bene esse, and not to the *esse* of a Christian; since notwithstanding the want of this, *Fabian* Bishop of *Rome* ordained *Novatian* a Presbyter.

The *Greek Euchology* shews, that such as were baptized, were after their baptism anointed, and so to be confirmed: and it subjoyning that the Eucharist was to be given to them, proves no more the one to be a rite of Baptism than the other.

The whole current of the Fathers runs, that in Confirmation the holy Ghost was conferred. *August. de Bapt. cont. Donatistas, lib.3.cap.16. Spiritus sanctus in solâ Catholicâ, per manus impositionem dari dicitur*, which he derives from the Apostles, tho these extraordinary effects of speaking of Tongues, or the like, did not follow upon it: *Sed invisibiliter & latenter per vinculum pacis, est eorum cordibus charitas divina inspirata.* And concludes, *Quid enim est aliud nisi oratio super hominem.*

And certainly, were Confirmation restored according to the Apostolical practice, and managed with a primitive sincerity, nothing should give more probable hopes of a recovery of the Christian Church, out of the darkness and deadness in which it hath continued so long. It might quicken persons more seriously to consider to what they were engaged in Baptism, when they were put to so solemn a renovation of it. But

the more denuded it were of all unnecessary rites, such as Oil, and the like, it might be more sutable to the Evangelical Spirit. And we see likewise from Antiquity, that there is no reason for appropriating this action wholly, or only to the Bishop. It should not be gone about till the person were ripe in years, and not only able by rote to recite a Catechism, but of a fitness to receive the Eucharist immediately after. But I shall conclude this whole matter with *Calvin*'s words, *lib.* 4. *Instit. cap.* 19. *sect.* 4. *& sequentibus:* where after he hath laid out the primitive practice of Confirmation, he subjoins: *Hæc disciplina, si hodie valeret, profecto parentum quorundam ignavia acueretur, qui liberorum institutionem, quasi rem nihil ad se pertinentem, negligunt; quam tum sine publico dedecore omittere non possent. Major esset in populo Christiano fidei consensus, nec tanta multorum inscitia, & ruditas, non adeo temere quidam novis, & peregrinis dogmatibus, abriperentur; omnibus denique esset quædam velut methodus doctrinæ Christianæ.*

A SUPPLEMENT ABOUT THE RURAL BISHOPS, CALLED *CHOREPISCOPI.*

IT hath been already marked, that the extent of the Dioceſes was not all of one proportion: and generally the Villages which lay adjacent to Cities, having received the Goſpel at firſt from them, continued in ſubjection to the City, as to their Mother Church: whereby the Biſhops Pariſh was not limited to the City, but did alſo include the adjacent Villages. The inſcription of *Clemens* his Epiſtles inſinuates this: Ἐκκλησία τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡ παροικοῦσα Ῥώμην. Τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ παροικούσῃ Κόρινθον. By which we ſee, that the Churches of *Rome* and *Corinth* were made up not onely of ſuch as inhabited the Towns, but alſo of ſuch as dwelt about them: and this is yet clearer from *Ignatius* his inſcription of his Epiſtle to the *Romans*; ἐκκλησία ἥτις προκάθηται ἐν τόπῳ χωρίου Ῥωμαίων. Neither did they judg it fit to ordain Biſhops in ſmaller or leſſer Cities, as appears by the Council of *Sardis*, Can. 6. where it is decreed, that a Biſhop

, ſhould

should not be ordained ἐν κώμῃ τινὶ ἢ βραχείᾳ πόλει ἢ τινὶ, καὶ εἷς μόνος πρεσβύτερος ἐπαρκεῖ. Adding, that it was not necessary that Bishops should be ordained there, lest the name and dignity of a Bishop should be vilipended.

But before this, it was decreed in the Council of *Laodicea*, Can. 57. ὅτι οὐ δεῖ ἐν ταῖς κώμαις, καὶ ἐν ταῖς χώραις καθίστασθαι ἐπισκόπους ἀλλὰ, (for so reads the Manuscript of *Oxford*, *Dionysius Exiguus*, *Isidore Mercator*, *Hervetus*, and *Justellus*; and not ἤ, *vel*, as *Binius*) περιοδευτὰς: who were to do nothing without the knowledg of the Bishop of the City, whom the learned *Beverigius* observes (on this Canon) to have been distinct from the Rural Bishops; which he makes out both from the Civil Law, and a place of *Gennadius*, where the Orders of Churchmen being reckoned, these circular Visitors are set in a middle rank betwixt the Rural Bishops and Presbyters. Frequent mention is also made of these Visitors in the Acts of the Council at *Chalcedon*. This course therefore they took for these Villages to send Presbyters from the City, who were called πρεσβύτεροι ἐπιχώριοι: and because the Bishop could not immediately over-see them himself, he did therefore substitute a Vicar and Delegate who was generally called χωρεπίσκοπος. The first time that we meet with any of these, is in the beginning of the fourth Century,

in

in the Councils of *Ancyra*, *Neocesarea*, and *Antiochia*. These differed from Presbyters, in that they got an Ordination distinct from theirs, called by the Council of *Antioch* ἡ χειροθεσία τῶν ἐπισκόπων. They also might have ordained *Subdeacons*, *Lectors*, and *Exorcists*, and given them commendatory Letters. But they differed from Bishops in these things: First, that they were ordained but by one Bishop, as appears by the tenth Canon of the Council of *Antioch*, χωρεπίσκοπον δὲ γίνεσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ τῆς πόλεως ᾗ ὑπόκειται ἐπισκόπου. And therefore it is true that *Balsamon* calls them, τῶν ἐπισκόπων ἐξαρχοί. Now we have already seen, that a Bishop must be ordained by two Bishops at least. Next, these χωρεπισκόποι were ordained μὴ ἔχοντες καθεδρὰς οἰκείας, saith *Zonaras*. And therefore in their subscriptions of the Councils, they only design themselves *Chorepiscopi*, without mentioning the place where they served, as the Bishops do. Now Bishops could not be ordained but with a Title to a particular charge and See. Thirdly, their power was limited, and in many things inferior to the power of Bishops. So Pope *Leo* the first, in his 88. *Epist.* *Quamvis, cum Episcopis plurima illis ministeriorum communis sit dispensatio, quædam tamen Ecclesiasticis regulis sibi prohibita norint, sicut Presbyterorum & Diaconorum consecratio.* They might in general do nothing ἄνευ γνώμης

ἐπισ-

ἐπισκόπου, and both the Council of *Ancyra*, Canon 13. And that of *Antioch*, Canon 10. diſcharge them the ordaining of Presbyters or Deacons. The words of the Council of *Antioch* are χωρὶς τῆς ἐπισκόπου, which words clearly import, that the Biſhop muſt have intervened in the Ordination, and ſo are wrong rendered by an old *Latin* Edition, *præter conſcientiam Epiſcopi.* As if they had heen only limited not to ordain unleſs the Biſhop gave warrant. And thus theſe Biſhops of the Villages and leſſer Cities were reduced from the degree of Biſhops, to an inferiour and limited Office, and were undoubtedly of the Epiſcopal Order, tho their authority was much abridged.

In the Council of *Neoceſarea* their relation to the Biſhop, is compared to that of the ſeventy Diſciples to the Apoſtles, and they are called Συλλειτουργοὶ. And that which is there marked as their chief work, is their care of the poor. But by the Canon of *Antioch*, they might have ordained *Lectors*, *Sub-Deacons*, and *Exorciſts*. And yet *Baſil* in his 181. *Epiſt.* ſaith, That they might not have ordained, even theſe inferiour ranks, without having firſt advertiſed the Biſhop, and ſent their teſtimonies, and the ſuffrages of their Election to him: which is obſerved by *Ariſtenus* in his Gloſs on the 13. Canon of *Ancyra*: and by *Mattheus Blaſtares* in his *Syntagma*, *cap.* 31.

But

But *Damaſus*, who was about the year 370. writes his whole fourth *Epiſtle* againſt them, telling that he found it decreed by his Predeceſſors, that they ſhould be aboliſhed, *Prohibiti tam ab hac ſacrâ ſede, quam à totius orbis Epiſcopis. — Nam (ut nobis relatum eſt) quidam Epiſcoporum, propter ſuam quietem, eis plebes ſuas committere non formidant.* And falls ſeverely on theſe Biſhops, and compares them to Mercenaries and Whores, that give out their Children to others to ſuckle. He proves they were not Biſhops, becauſe not ordained by three Biſhops, and deſcants upon the Canons of *Neoceſarea* and *Antioch*, which ſeem to import, as if they had the Ordination of Biſhops; adding, *Ceſſet ergo, ceſſet tot vicibus damnata præſumptio.* And yet Pope *Leo* (as we have already cited) who was Biſhop of *Rome* about 70. years after him, makes mention of them. And notwithſtanding all he ſaith againſt them, of their being condemned, it doth not appear when or where it was ſo done. Expreſs mention is made of them in the Council of *Nice*, Canon 8. as of a rank diſtinct from Preſbyters. It being there provided, that ſuch καθαροί, as returned to the unity of the Church, ſhould continue in that ſame Order of the Clergy, wherein they were before, only ſuch of them as were Biſhops might not continue Biſhops of a City, where there was already a Biſhop

ſhop placed: becauſe there could not be two Biſhops in one City: but if it pleaſed the Biſhop, they might either retain the bare name of a Biſhop, or be made *Chorepiſcopi*, or continue among the Presbyters.

Mention alſo is made of them in the 2. Canon of the general Council of *Chalcedon*, which ſhews, that at that time they were not wholly taken away: but the lateſt accounts we have of them is in *France*, where it ſeems they continued longeſt. *Conc. Pariſ. An.* 829. they are *cap.* 27. compared to the 70 Diſciples, according to that of *Neoceſarea*, and Biſhops are appointed to ſee that they did nothing beyond what was permitted to them by the Canons. The like is decreed *Conc. Meldenſi*, *An.* 845. *cap.* 44. And it is expreſſed there, that they might neither give the holy *Chriſma*, nor the holy Ghoſt, nor confer any Order above that of a Subdeacon, nor conſecrate Churches. *Conc. Metenſi*, *Anno* 888. *cap.* 5. It was decreed, That Churches conſecrated by them were to be again conſecrated by a Biſhop, and any thing they did which was proper to a Biſhop was declared null, and they are reckoned all one with Presbyters; and here we loſe ſight of them, hearing no more of them: for as they aroſe inſenſibly, ſo they vaniſhed in the like faſhion. So much of them and upon the firſt Canon.

THE

The Second CANON.

Πρεσβύτερος ὑπὸ ἑνὸς ἐπισκόπου χειροτονείσθω καὶ διάκονος, καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ κληρικοί.

A Presbyter ſhall be ordained by one Biſhop, ſo likewiſe a Deacon, and the reſt of the Clergy.

WE find moſt of the Fathers, even *Jerome* himſelf, drawing the ſubordination among Churchmen from what was under the Law; and therefore Deacons were ordinarily called *Levites*. But there is more ground to think, it was immediately taken from the form of the Synagogue, tho that conſtitution might have had its riſe from the model of the Temple-ſervice. I ſhall not here engage in a large Examen of the firſt Origine and riſe of the Synagogues, or of the worſhip performed in them, or debate whether they began before

fore the Captivity, in it, or after it. Nor what ground there may be from the word *Synagogue* uſed *Pſalm* 74.8. to aſſert their early date. But certain it is, that the Temple-worſhip was merely typical, in which the whole people were to aſſiſt, but at a few returns of the year. And beſide this, the Law of Nature dictates, that *GOD* is to be frequently and ſolemnly worſhipped by ſuch as acknowledge his great Name, which will plead for an early riſe to theſe Aſſemblies.

But be in that what may be, two things are certain. The one is, that Synagogues were conſtitute in our Saviour's time, and that there were Rulers, and chief Rulers in theſe Synagogues, that in them Prayers were ſaid, the Law was read, expounded, and exhortations made upon it, and Diſcipline was uſed, and ſuch as were faulty were caſt out of theſe Synagogues. All this is evident from the New Teſtament: and much more than this can be gathered out of *Jewiſh* writings. Now our Saviour's going into theſe Synagogues, reading the Law, and preaching in them, doth abundantly evince, that this conſtitution was not unlawful.

Another thing is as clear from the Old Teſtament, that there was neither written command, nor warrant for ſuch Aſſemblies; and the contrary of this none can undertake to make out.

From

From which positions, both of them equally clear and certain, a great step might be made for the calming and composing of debates about Government, were heats and prejudices out of the way. It being apparent, that there was an entire frame of Church-Government, and worship among the *Jews*, which was not unlawful, though not of divine Institution.

In the Synagogues there was (as is marked before) first, one that was called the *Bishop of the Congregation*. Next, the three Orderers, and Judges of every thing about the Synagogue, who were called *Tsekenim*, and by the *Greeks* ἀρχισυνάγωγοι, or γέροντες. These ordered and determined every thing that concerned the Synagogues, or the persons in it. Next them, were the three *Parnassin* or *Deacons*, whose charge was to gather the collections of the Rich, and to distribute them to the poor: And these were called *Septem viri boni Civitatis*. The term *Elder*, was generally given to all their Judges: but chiefly to these of the great *Sanhedrin*, so we have it, *Matth.* 16. 21. *Mark* 8. 31. 14. 43. and 15. 1. And *Acts* 23. 14. And for a fuller satisfaction to this, I must refer you to such as have given an account of the Synagogue out of the *Jewish* Writers.

Next, a great deal might be said, to prove that the Apostles in their first constitutions, took

things as they had them modelled to their hand in the Synagogue: and this they did, both becauſe it was not their deſign to innovate, except where the nature of the Goſpel Diſpenſation obliged them to it. As alſo, becauſe they took all means poſſible to gain the *Jews*, who we find were zealous adherers to the traditions of their Fathers, and not eaſily weaned from theſe precepts of *Moſes*, which by *Chriſt*'s Death were evacuated: And if the Apoſtles went ſo great a length in complying with them in greater matters, as Circumciſion, and other legal obſervances, (which appears from the *Acts* and *Epiſtles*) we have good grounds to ſuppoſe, that they would have yielded to them in what was more innocent and leſs important. Beſides, there appears both in our *Lord* himſelf, and in his Apoſtles, a great inclination to ſymbolize with them, as far as was poſſible. Now the nature of the Chriſtian Worſhip ſhews evidently, that it came in the room of the Synagogue, which was moral, and not of the Temple-Worſhip, which was typical and ceremonial. Likewiſe, this parity of Cuſtoms betwixt the *Jews* and Chriſtians, was ſuch, that it made them be taken by the *Romans*, and other more overly obſervers, for one ſect of Religion: and finally, any that will impartially read the New Teſtament, will find, that when the forms of Govern-

Government, or Worſhip are treated of, it is not done with ſuch architectonical exactneſs, as was neceſſary, if a new thing had been inſtituted, which we find practiced by *Moſes*. But the Apoſtles rather ſpeak, as theſe who give rules for the ordering, and directing of what was already in being. From all which it ſeems well grounded and rational to aſſume, that the firſt conſtitution of the Chriſtian Churches, was taken from the model of the Synagogue, in which theſe Elders were ſeparated, for the diſcharge of their imployments, by an impoſition of hands, as all *Jewiſh* Writers do clearly witneſs.

So the Presbyters of the Chriſtian Church were ordained by an Impoſition of hands. Their power was not only to preach, which (as I ſhewed already) was common to others, but alſo to adminiſter Sacraments; ſo that it is true which *Jerome* ſaith, *Communi conſilio Presbyterorum res gerebantur.*

We have already conſidered, how neceſſary it was judged, that no Ordination of Presbyters might be gone about without the preſence and concurrence of the Biſhop, as the principal Perſon, which was judged neceſſary (as I ſuppoſe) more upon the account of Unity and Order, than from the nature of the thing in its ſelf: for taking things in themſelves, it will follow, that

whatever power one hath, he may tranſmit to another; and therefore there ſeems to be ſmall reaſon, why one who hath the power of preaching the Goſpel, and adminiſtring Sacraments, may not alſo transmit the ſame to others: and it ſeems unreaſonable ſo to appropriate this to a Biſhop, as to annul theſe Ordinations which were managed by Presbyters, where Biſhops could not be had. *Maimonides* ſaith, *Every one regularly ordained, hath power to ordain his Diſciples alſo.*

There remains nothing to be cleared about this from Antiquity, ſave the 13 Canon of the Council of *Ancyra*, which runs thus. Χωρεπισκόποις μὴ ἐξεῖναι πρεσβυτέρους ἢ διακόνους χειροτονεῖν, ἀλλὰ μηδὲ πρεσβυτέρους, (others read) πρεσβυτέρους πόλεως χωρὶς τῆς ἐπιτραπῆναι ὑπὸ τῆς ἐπισκόπου μὴ γραμμάτων ἐν ἑτέρᾳ παροικίᾳ. Others read ἐκδοσι παροικίᾳ.

Now the difficulty raiſed about this Canon is this, that if the reading be ἔκδοσι and πρεσβυτέρους, then it will follow, that the Presbyters of the City might have ordained without the Biſhops preſence, if they had his warrant in writing. Yea, they alſo infer, that it is probable that before that, they ordained even without the Biſhops warrant, to which they were limited by this Canon: and upon this *Wallo Meſſalinus* triumphs not a little. But *Blondel* chuſed ra-

rather to read the Canon πρεσβυτέρους; as if the meaning of it were, that the *Chorepiſcopi* could not have ordained either Presbyters or Deacons; nor the Presbyters of the City without the Biſhops Warrant in writing; which will infer, that they might have done it being ſo warranted. It is true, *Binnius* hath read it ſo; ſo alſo hath *Gentianus Hervetus*, as appears by his *Latin* verſion of this Council. The *Arabick Manuſcript* alſo favors this. And it is directly aſſerted by *Zonaras* on this Canon, and *Ariſtenus*.

But it is contradicted by the whole tract of Antiquity, whom we find all concurring in this, that the *Chorepiſcopi* might neither ordain Preſbyters, nor Deacons without a Biſhop, as was cleared in its due place. Fut for that of *Wallo Meſſalinus*, it will appear to be ill grounded: For firſt, it is certain that the *Chorepiſcopi* were a dignity above Presbyters. It will be therefore unreaſonable to think that Presbyters could do that which was unlawful to the other. Beſides, how bad an Inference is it from one Canon of a Provincial Council, of which there are ſuch various readings, to argue for a thing which is not only without any other ground, but alſo contrary to the whole Current of Antiquity? And it was but few years after this, that in *Alexandria* the Ordinations given by *Coluthus*, who

was but a Presbyter, and only φανῆναι τὸν ἐπίσκοπον, were annulled. Now *Ancyra* being in *Asia* the lesser, and divers Bishops out of *Syria* being there, in particular the Bishops of *Antioch* and *Cesarea*, who subscribed first; how came it that there was no notice of this had at *Alexandria*, to have prevented their severe Sentence in the Case of *Coluthus*?

But to consider the readings of the Canon, *Binius* reads it ἑτέρᾳ so *Justellus*: it is true, he hath on the margin (*aliter* ἐνδέσῃ) *Hervetus* hath translated it, *in aliena Parochia*. Now if this be the true reading, the meaning of it will run thus. Whereas by a great many other Canons, Presbyters were so tied to their Bishop, that no Bishop was to receive the Presbyter of another Bishop, without his Bishops Warrant and Licence, and his *literæ pacificæ*, and *dimissoriæ*. So here the Presbyters of the City are discharged to go and assist at Ordinations, in other Parishes, without a written Licence from their own Bishop.

But as this Canon is read (ἐνδέσῃ) by some, so they seem to have added to it, μηδὲν πρᾶξαι, or μηδὲν κελεῦσαι; so that the meaning of it is, that the Presbyters of the City might do nothing without the Bishop's Warrant and Licence in writing: Thus have both *Isidorus Mercator*, and *Dionysius Exiguus* read it, as appears by their *La-*

tin

tin versions which are, *Sed nec Presbyteris civitatis (licet) sine Episcopi præcepto, aliquid amplius imperare, vel sine authoritate literarum ejus in unaquaque Parochiâ aliquid agere.* And this is according to *Binius*'s Edition of them. But in another Edition of *Dionysius Exiguus* by *Justellus*, he seems to have read it simply ἐνός, without any supplement.

Another old *Latin* Edition published by *Justellus* hath, *Sed neque Presbyteris civitatis licere, sine jussione Episcopi, sed cum ejusdem literis eundi ad singulas Parochias. Joannes Antiochen* in his *Collectio Canonum*, reads it simply ἐνός μεγίνε. *Ferrandus* in his *Breviatio Canonum*, Canon 92. cites this part of the Canon thus: *Ut Presbyteri civitatis, sine jussu Episcopi, nihil jubeant, nec in unaquaque Parœciâ aliquid agant. Alexius Aristinus* in his *Synopsis*, hath the first part of the Canon, but wants the second part. (And in his Gloss agrees with *Zonaras*, as was before observed.) And so doth *Simeon Logotheta*, in his *Epitome Canonum*. And by this diversity of reading, it will appear how little ground there is for founding any thing upon this Canon alone, especially when that alledged from it, is contradicted by undeniable Evidences.

But as Presbyters might not ordain without Bishops, so neither could Bishops ordain without the advice, consent, and concurrence of

their Presbyters *Conc. Carth.* 4. *Canon* 22. *Ut Episcopus, sine concilio Clericorum suorum, Clericos non ordinet, ita ut civium testimonium & conniventiam quærat.* And it was laid to *Chrysostom*'s charge, ὅτι ἀνεὺ συνεδρίου καὶ παρὰ γνώμης τοῦ κλήρου ποιεῖ τὰς χειροτονίας. And in the *Roman Council* held by *Sylvester* (if credit be due to the Registers of that Council, which are indeed justly questionable) it was decreed, *cap.* 11. that one was to be ordained a Presbyter, *cum omnes Presbyteri declararent & firmarent, & sic ad ordinem Presbyterii accederet.* And none was to be made a Bishop, *nisi omnis Clerus expeteret uno voto perenni.*

It is likewise certain, that all things were done by the joint advice of Bishop and Presbyters. Neither were these wretched contests, of the limits of Power, much thought on, or tossed among them. The Bishops pretending to no more, than Presbyters were willing to yield to them; and Presbyters claiming no more than Bishops were ready to allow them. Their contentions lay chiefly with these that were without; those intestine Fewds and Broils being reserved for our unhappy days.

But as we find *Cyprian* amply declaring, how he resolved to do nothing without the consent of his Clergy, and People: so in the *African* Churches, that course continued longest in vigor.

vigor. Divers inſtances whereof appear in the 4. *Council* of *Carthage*; one I have already cited, to which I ſhall add three more, *Can.* 23. *Epiſcopus nullius cauſam audiat, abſque præſentiâ Clericorum ſuorum, alioquin irrita erit ſententia Epiſcopi, niſi Clericorum præſentiâ confirmetur.* *Can.* 34. *Epiſcopus in quolibet loco ſedens, ſtare Presbyterum non patiatur.* And *Can.* 35. *Epiſcopus in Eccleſiâ, & in conſeſſu Presbyterorum, ſublimior ſedeat; intra domum vero, collegam Prebyterorum ſeſe eſſe cognoſcat.*

There were two ranks of Presbyters, as clearly appears from the 13. Canon of *Neoceſarea*, to wit, the Presbyters of the City, and the Preſbyters of the Country. The former were the more eminent, in ſo far that the latter might not conſecrate the Euchariſt within the Church of the City in their preſence, which appears from the cited Canon. Over the Presbyters of the Country were the *Chorepiſcopi*, of whom already; but the Presbyters of the City being next at hand, were the Biſhops Counſel, and adviſers in all matters. The Biſhop and they had the overſight of the Souls within the City. They were alſo to be maintained out of the Treaſury of the Church, and were called *Canonici* or *Præbendarii*. The reaſon why they were called *Canonici*, was either, becauſe of their regular obſerving of the courſe of Worſhip, and hours of Prayer

Prayer: or becauſe of the diſtributions that were made among them, according to the Canon or Rule, and from the ſhare that was aſſigned to them, called *Præbenda*, they got the name *Præbendarii*.

This *Conſeſſus* or *Collegium Presbyterorum*, was afterwards deſigned by the barbarous word *Capitulum*. The chief over them, or the *Vice præſes* next to the Biſhop was called *Archipresbyter*, or *Decanus*, *Idem quod decurio, qui decem militibus præerat:* And inſenſibly the whole Eccleſiaſtical Juriſdiction crept into their hands. The Preſbyters of the Country either neglecting it, or being neglected in it. But without the *Capitulum*, nothing that the Biſhop did was valid.

However, when the firſt fervor and vigor of Church-Diſcipline ſlacken'd: avarice and ambition creeping in apace into the Hearts of Churchmen, theſe *Chanoins* or *Præbends* not contented with their allowances out of the Church of the City, which were too ſmall for their growing deſires, got Churches in the Country annexed to them: and for moſt part ſerv'd them by Subſtitutes, except at the return of ſome ſolemn Feſtivities: and by this means it was, that Church-Diſcipline fell totally into the Biſhops hands; and the ancient model being laid aſide, new Courts which were unknown to Antiquity, were ſet up. As theſe of the *Arch-dea-*

cons

cons, Chancellors, Officials, Surrogates, &c. However the *Præbends*, though they had deſerted their Intereſt in Church-Diſcipline, yet two things they ſtuck to, becauſe of the advantage and power that followed them.

The one was the capitular Elections of the Biſhop, and the other was the meddling with, and diſpoſing of the Church Revenues, and Treaſure. But it was a groſs Contradiction to the ends of Government, that the Biſhop alone might manage the Spiritual part of his Charge, but muſt be limited to the advice of his Presbyters for the governing of the Temporality. Yet this was a farther proof of that ſaying, *Religio peperit divitias, & filia devoravit matrem.* And thus far we have ſeen what Intereſt Presbyters had within their own Pariſh, (mark that at firſt the Biſhops Precinct was called *Pariſh*, and not *Dioceſe*) neither was the meeting of the Biſhop with his Presbyters called a Synod: by which we ſee how weak that Allegiance is, that there were no *Dioceſan Biſhops* in the firſt Centuries, it being merely a playing with the word *Dioceſs.*

But let us next conſider what Intereſt *Presbyters* had in *Provincial* or *National Councils.* If that of the *Acts* 15. was a Synod, in it we have *Presbyter* ſubſcribing with the Apoſtles. *Brethren* are alſo there added, not as if there had been

been any Laicks elected out of the Laity, ſuch as theſe are who are now vulgarly called *Lay-Elders*, but ſome more eminent Chriſtians, whom as the Apoſtles call'd then, ſo the Biſhops continued afterward to conſult and adviſe with in Eccleſiaſtick matters. But that Presbyters ſate in Provincial Synods in the firſt and pureſt Ages, is undeniably clear. When *Victor* held the Council at *Rome* about the day of *Eaſter*, *Damaſus* tells that it was *collatione facta cum Presbyteris & Diaconibus*. Likewiſe in the Council that *Cyprian* held, about the rebaptizing of Hereticks, there were preſent, *Epiſcopi plurimi ex provinciâ Africanâ, Numidiâ, Mauritaniâ, cum Presbyteris & Diaconibus, præſente etiam plebis maximâ parte.* And his contemporary *Firmilian*, whoſe Epiſtle is the 75. among *Cyprian*'s, tells us, how there were yearly Synods of Biſhops and Preſbyters, *Quâ ex causâ*, ſaith he, *neceſſario apud nos ſit, ut per ſingulos annos ſeniores & Presbyteri*, (by which it is clear, that he can mean none, but Presbyters and Biſhops) *in unum conveniamus, ad diſponenda ea, quæ curæ noſtræ commiſſa ſunt.*

Euſebius lib. 6. *cap.* 35. tells, That upon the account of *Novatus*'s Schiſm, there was held at *Rome* σύνοδον μείζω, which conſiſted of ſixty Biſhops, and many more Presbyters, and Deacons, πλειόνων δ' ἔτι μᾶλλον πρεσβυτέρων, καὶ διακόνων. He likewiſe tells, *lib.* 7. *cap.* 27. How that

that upon *Samoſatenus*'s Hereſie, there was a great Synod held in *Antioch*: and after he hath ſet down the names of ſome Biſhops there preſent, he adds, that there were μετ' ἄλλοι ἅμα πρεσβυτέροις, καὶ διακόνοις. And their Synodal Letter is written in the name of the Biſhops, Presbyters and Deacons.

In the Council of *Eliberis* in *Spain*, there were 19. Biſhops, *reſidentibus triginta ſex Presbyteris, abſtantibus Diaconibus & omni plebe.* In the Provincial Council at *Arles*, which judged in the matter of *Donatus*'s Schiſm, *Conſtantine* the Emperor being preſent, where were about two hundred Biſhops from divers Nations, from *Italy*, *France*, *Spain*, *Sicily*, *Sardinia*, *Africk*, *Numidia*, and *Britain*, the Canons of that Council are ſubſcribed by many Presbyters and Deacons. And if the Story of the Council of *Rome* under *Sylveſter* be true, it is ſubſcribed by 284. Biſhops, 45. Presbyters, and 5. Deacons. Now all theſe being before the Council of *Nice*, evince that in the firſt and beſt ages, Presbyters voted and judged in Provincial Councils, and if in Provincials, why not in General ones?

The Council of *Nice* is ſubſcribed by ſome *Chorepiſcopi*, and one *Chorepiſcopus* ſubſcribes in the Council of *Epheſus*, And if *Chorepiſcopi* be (as it is the opinion of ſome) in their natural dignity only Presbyters, then we have Presbyters

ters also subscribing General Councils. Besides that in the Council of *Constantinople*, and *Ephesus*, divers Bishops subscribed by Presbyters: from all which it is clear, that there is no ground from Antiquity to exclude Presbyters from a Suffrage in national and general Councils: and it is but a frivolous distinction that they may have a consultative, tho not a deliberative Suffrage, since we see them subscribing both the decisions of Faith and Canons of discipline.

The next thing to be examined, is the qualification, election, and ordination of Presbyters. For their qualification, great care was used to train them up long in an abstracted and devote Life, that so they might be well prepared for that holy Function. And therefore it was, that many of the Primitive Bishops lived in Monasteries among them, whom they were educating for holy Orders, as appears from the Lives of *Basil*, *Augustine*, and *Martin*: Neither was one to be ordained a Presbyter, but after a long probation and tryal, and all these degrees, of which we shall speak afterward, were so many steps and preparations through which all were to go, before they could be initiated. And indeed it seems against reason, at first step to ordain a man Presbyter, and commit the care of Souls to him, before a long previous probation had of him.

Therefore the ancient Monasteries, as they were

were Sanctuaries for such as designed to leave the World, and live devoutly, so they were also Colleges for the Education of Churchmen. It is true, the years of Probation may seem too too many; but they ordinarily dispensed in that, as they found Persons worthy and qualified. But none might be Presbyter before he were thirty years of age, according to the Council of *Neocesarea*, even tho he were highly worthy (πάνυ ἄξιος.) And the reason given for this, is, because *Christ* was thirty years of age before he entred upon the discharge of his holy Function.

Likewise a *Clinicus*, that is, one baptised in sickness, by the twelfth Canon of *Neocesarea*, could not have been a Presbyter, because he was not a Christian, ἐκ προαιρέσεως ἀλλ' ἐξ ἀνάγκης. And this was not to be dispensed with, but upon his following Faith and Diligence, or that others could not be had.

And in the *Canon Law*, *dist.* 77. *cap. Siquis*, among other prerequisites for a Presbyter, one is: *Si pœnitentiam publicam non gesserit*, holding that any gross scandal committed after Baptism, should be a bar upon a Man from being ordained a Presbyter.

As also *Dist.* 56. *cap.* 1. the Children of Presbyters are discharged to be ordained: *Presbyterorum filios à sacris altaris ministeriis removemus, nisi aut in Cœnobiis, aut in Canonicis religiosè probati fuerint*

fuerint converſari. It is like, this was either to diſcourage the marriage of Churchmen, or to obviate the ſcandal might have been taken, if they had been partial to their own Children. Yet this was neither old nor univerſal; for *Nazianzen* was both a Presbyter and a Biſhop, though a Biſhop's Son. And in the next Chapter of that ſame *Diſt.* many inſtances are alledged by *Damaſus* to the contrary.

Further, none who had been Soldiers, and were *Curiales*, and *obſtricti curiæ*, could have been ordained without a dimiſſion, and that they had been fifteen years in a Monaſtery, and three parts of four of their Eſtate were adjudged to the fisk; ſo *Diſt.* 53. and *Juſtinian* 123. *Nov.* Now this might be firſt, leſt any weary of the ſervice to which they were obliged, ſhould upon that pretence ſhake it off, and run from their colors, or other employments. But next, that men who had been much involved in the World, and particularly men of bloud, might not enter into holy Orders, without a long precedent change of the courſe of their life; it not being eaſie to paſs of a ſudden from a courſe of ſecularity, to that ſublimity of holineſs which is neceſſary for ſuch a ſacred Function.

And finally, all *ambitus* was condemned in Presbyters, as well as in Biſhops, though we ſee both from *Chryſoſtom*'s Books *de Sacerdotio*, and *Nazian-*

Nazianzen's *Apologetick*, that there was enough of it among both kinds. Yet many there were who reſiſted the Calls given them to Church-Offices with great earneſtneſs, ſome flying from them to the Wilderneſs, as from a perſecution: ſome cutting off their Noſes, and other members, that they might be thought unworthy of it; ſome continued to the end in their refuſal: others were not ordained without being haled even by force; many receiving this ſacred impoſition of hands with trembling and many tears. And indeed were the greatneſs of the charge more weighed, and the ſecular advantages leſs looked at, it is like there might be yet need of ſome force to draw men to accept of it; whereas all are ſo forward to ruſh toward it, blown up with pride, or provoked by covetouſneſs.

We ſaw already how averſe *Nazianzen* was from entring in ſacred Orders: but no leſs memorable is the Hiſtory of *Chryſoſtome*, who (with his Friend *Baſil*) having engaged in a Monaſtick life, was ſtruck with fear when a rumour roſe that they were both to be ordained Presbyters. (And by the way obſerve, that he calls it τὸ ἐπίσκοπης ἀξίωμα.) But *Chryſoſtome* was ſilent, leſt the expreſſing of his averſion ſhould have deterred *Baſil*; and his his ſilence was judged by *Baſil* a conſent, and ſo proved one of his

chief inducements to accept of Orders. But when the day came wherein *Chryſoſtome* knew that the Biſhops deſigned to ordain them, he withdrew privately, ſo that he could not be found: yet the Biſhops upon another pretence, carried *Baſil* to the Church, and there ordained him, much againſt his mind.

But when he firſt met with his Friend *Chryſoſtome*, he melted down in tears, challenging him ſeverely for his withdrawing from him; whereof *Chryſoſtome* gives his Apology at large in theſe ſix excellent Books of his *de Sacerdotio*; wherein by way of Dialogue betwixt him and his Friend, he layeth out the great dignity and weight of that Charge, chiefly in the third Book, where he ſhews, *That a Prieſt ſhould be like one of the Angels of GOD*, *cap.* 4. And he blames theſe Elections that were raſhly made, *cap.* 10. upon which he charges moſt of the diſorders that were then in the Church. And *cap.* 11. he confeſſeth how guilty himſelf was of that unlawful *ambitus* for Church employment; which being yet unmortified in him, did frighten him from entring in holy Orders. *Cap.* 14. he ſaith, *Epiſcopum convenit ſtudio acri & perpetuâ vitæ continentia tanquam adamantinis armis obſeptum eſſe.* In the fourth Book he ſpeaks of the great caution was to be uſed in Elections and Ordinations, complaining that in theſe, *Regard was rather had*

to

to Riches and Honor, than true worth. Through the fifth Book he shews the great evil and hazard of popular applause, and the sin of being much pleased with it. And *lib.* 6. *cap.* 2. he hath that excellent saying, *That the soul of the Priest should be purer than the very beams of the Sun themselves.* Καὶ γὰρ τῶν ἀκτίνων αὐτῶν καθαρωτέραν τῷ ἱερεῖ τὴν ψυχὴν εἶναι δεῖ. And *cap.* 12. he accuses himself of his vain desires and other faults, whence it was that he had so great a horrour of attempting at that for which he knew himself so unworthy: preoccupying that Objection, that a Man in that is to submit to the judgment of others, by the Examples of one who hath no skill in Physick, and knowing himself ignorant, is not to administer Physick, though all the World should desire him to undertake a Cure, declaring their Opinion and confidence of his skill: for if upon another mans opinion of his skill he should offer to meddle in it, and give Physick, he might as well kill as cure. So neither one unacquainted in military affairs, was to undertake the leading of an Army, knowing his own unfitness, though never so much solicited to it: whence he subsumes more strongly, that none should undertake the leading of Souls, as long as he knew his own unfitness, were the importunities and solicitations of others never so many. And so far of the qualifications of

thoſe who were to be ordained Presbyters.

Their Election hath been touched already, for it went the ſame way with the Elections of Biſhops, and ſo was partly popular, at leaſt was to be ratified by the approbation, and conſent of the people. *Poſſidius in vita Auguſtini*, tells how he was choſen a Presbyter by the people.

We have the Ordination of the Presbyters ſet down thus, *Conc. Carth.* 4. *Canon.* 3. *Presbyter quum ordinatur, Epiſcopo eum benedicente, & manum ſuper caput ejus tenente, etiam omnes Presbyteri, qui præſentes ſunt, manus ſuas juxta manum Epiſcopi ſuper caput illius teneant.* *Dionyſius* the *Areopagite* in the forecited place tells, That the Preſbyter whom he calls ἱερεὺς, was ordained in the ſame form that a Biſhop was ordained, ſave only that the Goſpel was not laid on his head. From which ſimplicity of the primitive forms, we may ſee, how far they were from all theſe ſuperſtitious Fopperies now uſed in the *Romiſh Church* in Ordination. And ſo much concerning Presbyters.

Deacons are next to be treated of. The Original of them is by the general current of the Ancients taken from the *Levites* under the Temple, and therefore in not a few of the antient *Councils*, they go under that deſignation. But as was formerly obſerved, it is more probable, that the Chriſtian Church took its immediate Model from

from the Synagogue, tho that might have been taken from the Temple. Now in the Synagogue, as there was a Biſhop and Presbyters, ſo there were alſo Deacons called *Parnaſin.* There were three of them in each Synagogue, two were to gather the Collections, and all the three together did diſtribute them.

The firſt Origine of them in the Chriſtian Church is ſet down, *Acts* 6. where their primitive inſtitution ſhews, that their firſt deſign was for looking to the neceſſities of the poor, who had been neglected in the daily diſtribution of the Charity, and there they are called *Διάκονοι.* It is true, that term *Luke* 4. 20. is uſed in another ſenſe, for there the *Miniſter of the Synagogue,* to whom *CHRIST* delivered the Book, could be no other, than their *Chazan* or Biſhop, whoſe Office it was to call out any to read the Law in the Synagogue. But ſince all Church-Office is for ſervice, and not for domination, Chriſt himſelf not coming *to be miniſtred unto, but to miniſter,* it is no wonder, if that term ſhould then have been promiſcuouſly uſed. We alſo find S. *Paul* applying to himſelf (1 *Cor.* 4. a term equivalent to this.) But though the primitive inſtitution of *Deacons* import only their looking to the neceſſities of the poor: yet from the *Levites* miniſtring to the Prieſt in the Sacrifices, it came to be generally received and uſed,

the Deacons ſhould ſerve the Biſhops and Presbyters in the adminiſtration of the Sacraments.

The inſtitution of them doth alſo diſcover, that they were perſons to be ſeparated for that holy ſervice, and conſecrated for it by an impoſition of hands; and ſo were to be no more ſecular, but Eccleſiaſtical perſons: and the uſual practice of the Church was to account that Office a ſtep, degree and probation, in order to ones being made a Presbyter. And therefore our mungrel *Lay-Deacons* differ vaſtly, both from the firſt inſtitution of the Scripture, and current of all Antiquity.

The *Areopagite* gives the account of their Ordinations thus: *That the Deacon being brought to the Biſhop, kneeled down on one knee, and ſo received impoſition of hands.* The fourth Canon of the fourth Council of *Carthage* is: *Diaconus quum ordinatur, ſolus Epiſcopus, qui eum benedicit, manum ſuper caput illius ponat; quia non ad Sacerdotium, ſed ad miniſterium conſecratur.*

As for their Election, at the firſt inſtitution they were choſen by the whole Body of the people, ſo *Acts* 6. And tho the people were barred their ſuffrage in the choice of other Church-Officers, yet there might be good reaſon why they ſhould ſtill chuſe the Deacons, their Office being almoſt wholly temporal, to

receive

receive and diſtribute the peoples alms. But whatever right people might pretend to in this, it will never be proved that by divine Right, the people ſhould chuſe thoſe who had the charge of their ſouls. For reaſon would infer, that none could make a choice, who were not able to give a judgment of the qualifications, and worth of a Churchman, that being peculiar to the Clergy. And hence it is that more than a conſent cannot be juſtly pretended to by the people. But after all this, if this place prove any thing, it will prove in favor of the whole body of the people, and not of a few ſelected *Lay-Elders.*

All the Deacons were in their degree and order inferiour to Presbyters, which will appear from theſe Canons of the 4. *Council* of *Carthage*, Canon 37. *The Deacon is declared to be the Miniſter of the Presbyter, as well as of the Biſhop.* Canon 39. *He might ſit in the preſence of a Presbyter, if deſired by him.* Canon 40. *In conventu Presbyterorum Diaconus interrogatus, loquatur*; ſo that he might not ſpeak, except deſired. It is therefore a diſorder in Church-diſcipline, that the Archdeacon ſhould not only be a Presbyter, but alſo exerciſe Juriſdiction over Presbyters. And therefore *Petrus Bleſenſis, Epiſt.* 123. hath well obſerved, how *turbato ordine dignitatis, Archidiaconi hodie Sacerdotibus præeminent, & in eos vim ac poteſtatem ſuæ Juriſdictionis exercent.*

Jerome is the first that makes mention of these *Arch deacons*, telling how the *Deacons* did chuse one of their number to be over them, *quem Archidiaconum vocabant*: and in the same Epistle to *Evagrius*, he severely inveighs against those *Deacons*, who pretend to an equality with, or preference over Presbyters, saying: *Quid patitur mensarum & viduarum Minister, ut supra eos tumidus sese efferat, ad quorum preces corpus sanguisque Christi conficitur.*

Because of the first number, *Seven*, the custom was to have but seven *Deacons* in a City were it never so great: so it was decreed in the Council of *Neocesarea* 14. Canon. Their Office was chiefly to look to the poor, and to serve in the administration of the Sacraments. *Justin Martyr* in the end of his second *Apology* tells, That the *Eucharist was sent by the Deacons to such as were absent.* *Cyprian lib.* 3. *Epist.* 15. reckons it as a part of the *Deacon's* Office *to wait upon the Martyrs*, and *Epist.* 17. of that same Book, he tells, That where there was no Presbyter, *& urgere exitus cœperit. The Deacon might receive the Exhomvlogesis of penitents, and absolve them by imposition of hands.* *Optatus lib.* 2. calls them the *Defenders of the holy Table*; telling how the *Donatists* had broken through the roof of a Church, and had killed and wounded some of the *Deacons*, who preserved the holy Elements from their sacrilegious attempt.

The

The *Deacons* diſtributed the Euchariſt, and ſometime they did give it to the Presbyters, but that was forbidden by the 18. *Can.* of the Council of *Nice.* Yet in the fourth Council of *Carthage*, *Can.* 38. *Diaconus, præſente Presbytero, Euchariſtiam corporis Chriſti populo ſi neceſſitas cogat, juſſus eroget. Cyril* of *Jeruſalem* in his 17. Catechiſm, counts the *Deacon* the Miniſter of Baptiſm, as well as the Biſhop or Presbyter. And certain it is, that generally Baptiſm was adminiſtred by the *Deacons*, as well as by the Presbyters.

Some parts of the publick Worſhip were alſo diſcharged by the *Deacons*. *Chryſoſtome hom.* 14. *ad Rom.* tells, that *the Deacons offered prayers for the people*; and *hom.* 17. *ad Heb.* he tells, *That the Deacons ſtood in a high place at the adminiſtration of the Euchariſt, and calling with a terrible voice, as Heraulds, invited ſome, and rejected others from theſe holy myſteries.* And thus far I have given an account of the ſenſe which the Ancients had of the Offices of *Biſhop*, *Presbyter*, and *Deacon*, which three were the only ones they accounted Sacred and Divine. And this hold good even at the time, that the *Areopagites*'s pretended Books were written (I call them pretended, becauſe there is none now ſo ſimple as to believe them his) for he reckons the Eccleſiaſtical Hierarchy to conſiſt in theſe three degrees.

To this account given of *Deacons*, I ſhall add ſome

somewhat of *Deaconesses*, of whom mention is made, *Rom.* 16. 1. where *Phebe* is called ἰ διάκονος the *Deaconess of the Church of Cenchrea*. They are likewise so called in the 15. Canon of *Chalcedon*; but more ordinary in ancient Writings διακόνισσα. *Jerome* on that place to the *Romans*, speaking of *Phebe*, understands her to have been a *Deaconess*: and adds, *Etiam nunc in Orientalibus Diaconissæ mulieres in suo sexu ministrare videntur, in baptismo, sive in ministerio verbi, quia privatim docuisse fœminas invenimus sicut Priscillam.* He likewise understood the Widows mentioned, 1 *Tim.* 5. to be Diaconesses: *Tales eligi voluit Diaconissas quæ omnibus essent exemplum vivendi.* *Origen* likewise takes it as undoubted, that *Phebe* had a particular office in the Church of *Cenchrea*: and saith on that place, *Hic locus Apostolica authoritate docet etiam fœminas in ministerio Ecclesiæ constitui, in quo officio positam Phœben apud Ecclesiam quæ est Cenchreis.* *Chrysostome* likewise understood it to be an Office: And saith on that place, ἢ τὸ ἀξίωμα σημαίνει, διάκονον εἰπών. If any credit be due to the *Apostolical Constitutions*, they tell us many things of their Office, tho with a great alloy of much idle stuff. They tell, *That no Woman might come to a Bishop or Presbyter, except in the company of a Deaconess*, Lib. 2. cap. 26. *And that they were to go to Womens Houses to instruct them, which had been scandalous for Churchmen,*

Lib. 3.

Lib.3.cap.15. *They did likewise receive them in Baptism, Cap.* 16. *And kept the gates by which Women entred into the Church,* Lib.8. cap.28. So it seems their Office was to instruct and teach Women. And so S. *Paul,* Phil. 4.3. speaks of *Women who laboured with him in the Gospel.* And *Rom.* 16. we find mention not only of *Priscilla, but of Triphona, Triphosa and Persis, who laboured in the Lord.* And it is like their Office was also to minister to the necessities of Churchmen: and therefore when S. *Paul* speaks of *leading about a Sister and a Wife, as well as other Apostles,* he may be well understood to speak of one of those who might both have supplied his wants, and assisted him in the conversion of Women; but for eviting scandal, they were not to be under sixty years of age.

Mention is made of them by *Pliny, lib.*10. *Epist.*97. who writing to *Trajan,* of the enquiry he was making of the Christians, saith, *Necessarium credidi ex duabus ancillis quæ ministræ dicebantur quid esset veri & per tormenta quærere.* They were received by an Ordination in *Tertullian*'s time: for he speaking of them, saith, *(De castit. cap.* 13.) *Ordinari in Ecclesia solent.* And *ad uxorem, lib.* 1. *cap.* 7. *Viduam allegi in ordinationem nisi univiram non concedit.* The 19. Canon of the Council of *Nice,* reckons the Deaconesses among those that were ἐν τῷ κλήρῳ, but saith that they

they had no imposition of hands, so that in all things they were reckoned among the Laicks; but hints that they had a particular habit, calling them τῶν ἐν τῷ σχήματι ἐξεταζομένων. *Balsamon's* Gloss on this is, that the Virgins who dedicated themselves to *GOD*, continued in a Laical habit till they were forty years of age; and were then, if found worthy, ordained Deaconesses, by a particular imposition of hands. To this *Zonaras* adds, that the Virgins in the twenty fifth year of their age, got a particular habit from the Bishop. The 74 Canon of *Nice*, according to the *Arabick* Edition, appoints the Office of a *Deaconess* to be only the receiving of Women in Baptism. *Epiph. hæres.* 79. after he hath proved that a Woman is not capable of the publick service of the Church, adds, That the Order of the *Deaconesses* was instituted out of reverence to that Sex, that when the Womans body was naked in Baptism, they might not be so seen by the Priest. And with this agrees the 12th Canon of the fourth Council of *Carthage*: *Viduæ vel sanctimoniales quæ ad ministerium baptizandarum mulierum eliguntur tam instructæ sint ad officium, ut possint apto & sano sermone docere imperitas & rusticas mulieres tempore quo baptizandæ sint, qualiter baptizatori interrogatæ respondeant, & qualiter accepto baptismate vivant.* This is also confirmed by the 6. *Chap.* of the 6. *Novel*, which appoints the age

age both for Virgins and Widows to be fifty years: *Sicque ſacram promereri ordinationem.* And their Office is denied to be *adorandis miniſtrare baptiſmatibus, & aliis adeſſe ſecretis quæ in venerabilibus miniſteriis per eas rite aguntur.* And the reſt of that Chapter gives divers other rules concerning them.

The 15. Canon of *Chalcedon*, appoints a *Deaconeſs* not to be ordained till ſhe were forty years of age (it is χειροτονεῖσθαι in the Canon) and it is appointed that it be done after a ſtrict examination; but that after ſhe was ordained, and continued ſome time in the Miniſtery, if ſhe gave her ſelf in Marriage, ſhe (as one that had reproached the grace of *GOD*) was to be anathematized with her Husband. *Zonaras* reconciles this age with the Apoſtle, that the Apoſtle ſpeaks of Widows, and this Canon of Virgins, tho it be γυναῖκα in the Canon. Yet it ſeems ſome of theſe *Deaconeſſes* have given ſcandal in the Church, and perhaps proved like the Females among the *Phariſees*, whom the *Rabbins* reckoned among theſe who deſtroyed the World: And ſo we find the *Weſtern* Church being ſcandalized at ſome miſcarriages in this Order, they are diſcharged to be ordained by the firſt Council of *Orange*, *Can.* 26. *Diaconiſſæ omnimodo non ordinandæ, ſi quæ jam ſunt benedictioni quæ populo impenditur, capita ſubmittunt.*

And

And in the beginning of the sixth *Century*, it seems they gave great scandal; for Canon 22. Council *Epaun.* they are simply discharged: *Viduarum consecrationem quas Diaconas vocant ab omni regione nostra penitus abrogamus, solam eis pœnitentiæ benedictionem si converti ambiant imponendo.* And *Anno* 536. *Con. Aurel.* 2. *Can.* 17. *Benedictio Diaconatus*, is said to be given to the Women *contra interdicta Canonum.* And the next Canon of that Council is, *Placuit etiam ut nulli postmodum fœminæ Diaconalis benedictio pro conditionis hujus fragilitate credatur.* Yet they are mentioned in the Council of *Worms* in the year 868. Canon 73. where the 15. Canon of *Chalcedon* is wholly insert. One scandal we find occasioned by these *Deaconesses*, was, that they presumed to distribute the Elements in the Eucharist; which *Gelasius* blames in his ninth Epistle written to the Bishops of *Lucania*, *Quod fœminæ sacris altaribus ministrare ferantur.* And this it seems hath continued longer: For we find *Ratherius* of *Verona* in the tenth *Century*, appoints in his Synodal Epistle (which in the Tomes of the Councils is printed as a Sermon of Pope *Leo* the fourths) *Nulla fœmina ad altare Domini accedat.* And *Matthæus Blastares* in his *Syntagma*, *lit.* Γ. *cap.* 11. concludes it to be unknown what the Office of the *Deaconesses* was. Some judged that they ministred to Women,

men, who being in age received Baptism, it being accounted a crime for a Man to see a Woman naked. Others thought that they might enter to the Altar, and exercise the Office of *Deacons*, who proved this from many things, particularly from some words of *Nazianzen*'s Oration at his Sisters Funeral, but that was afterwards forbidden διὰ τὴν τῶν ἐμμήνων ἀπροαίρετον ῥύσιν; yet he doubts much the truth of that, it not agreeing with reason, that Women who were not suffered publickly to teach, should be admitted to the Office of a *Deacon*, whose duty it was by the ministery of the word, to purifie these who were to be baptized. And after that he gives an account of the form of their Ordination.

Mention likewise is made of them in the *Council in Trullo, Canon* 14. *A Deaconess was not to receive imposition of hands, before she was forty years of age.* Which is more expressly appointed in the 40. Canon, where they decree, that though the Apostle made the age 60. yet the Canons had allowed their Ordination at 40. because they found the Church was become firmer in the grace of *GOD*, and had advanced forward: and by the 48. Canon of that *Council*, a Bishop's Wife, when separated from her Husband by consent, was to live in a Monastery, and if found worthy might be made a *Deaconess.*

ness. *Basil* by his 18. Canon allows Virgins to be received at the sixteenth or seventeenth year of their age, but by his 24. he reckons it a fault to receive a Widow into the Order under 60: yet it seems that was not peremptorily observed. For in his 44. Canon he speaks of *Deaconesses* found in Fornication, who might not be allowed to communicate before seven years had been past in penitence. Whence this Order failed in the *Greek* Church, we know not; but *Balsamon* on the 15. Canon of *Chalcedon* tells, That in his time *Deaconesses* were no more ordained, and his reason is, because no Woman was suffered to enter unto the Altar, though (saith he) some Women were abusively so called.

As for the inferiour degrees of *Subdeacon*, *Acolyth*, &c. as they were only *Juris Ecclesiastici*, so they were not designed for any sacred performance, nor had they any holy Character upon them: but were intended as steps for those whom they were training up to sacred employments, and were but like the degrees given in Universities. No mention is made of them in the first two *Centuries*: *Ignatius* is expres that there is no intermedial step betwixt the Laick, and the *Deacon*, which stile we also meet in all the Fathers before *Cyprian*'s time.

He, Epistle 24. speaks of the *Lectors* and *Subdeacons*, telling how he had ordained *Saturus* a Lector,

Lector, and *Optatus* a Subdeacon, *quos jam communi consilio Clero proximos feceramus.* And of the *Lectors*, he saith, Epist. 34. *Cæterum Presbyterii honorem nos illis designasse sciatis.* And by what follows, it is clear he means of a share in the maintenance of the Church. Epistle 28. he speaks of the *Subdeacons* and *Acolyths*, shewing how they likewise had a share in the divisions of the offerings made to the Church. Epistle 33. he tells of one *Aurelius*, who had been twice a Confessor in the persecution, whom he had ordained a Lector, apologizing that he had done it without the consent of his Clergy and people. *In ordinationibus solemus vos ante consulere, & voces ac merita communi consilio ponderare; sed expectanda non sunt testimonia humana, cum præcedant suffragia divina.* And after he hath laid out the merits of the Person, he adds, *Placuit tamen ut ab officio Lectionis incipiat, quia & nihil magis congruit voci quæ Dominum gloriosâ prædicatione confessa est, quam celebrandis divinis lectionibus personare.* Of the same strain is his following Epistle concerning *Celerinus*, who had refused to be ordained a Lector, until he was perswaded to it by a divine Revelation in the Night. Likewise in his 76. Epistle, he makes mention of *Exorcists*: who are also mentioned by *Firmilian* in his Epistle, which is reckoned the 75. among *Cyprians*. And at the

ſame time *Cornelius*, the Biſhop of *Rome*, in his Epiſtle (inſert by *Euſebius*, *lib.*6. *cap.*43.) wherein he gives account of the Clergy were then at *Rome*; tells, That *there were* 46 *Presbyters*, 7 *Deacons*, 42 *Acolyths*, 50 *Exorciſts*, *Lectors*, and *Porters*. Theſe inferiour Orders we ſee were then in the Church. And ſince we have no earlier accounts of them, we may conclude their riſe to have been about this time. A ſhort account will ſuffice for their ſeveral employments, which will be beſt gathered from the ſeveral Canons of the 4th Council of *Carthage*.

Canon 5. *Subdiaconus quum ordinatur, quia manus impoſitionem non accipit, patinam de Epiſcopi manu accipiat vacuam, & calicem vacuum. De manu vero Archidiaconi urceolum cum aquâ, & mantile, & manutergium.* So his Office was to look to the Veſſels for the Euchariſt, and to ſerve the *Deacons* in that work.

Canon 6. *Acolythus quum ordinatur ab Epiſcopo quidem doceatur, qualiter in officio ſuo agere debeat. Sed ab Archidiacono accipiat ceroferarium cum cereo ut ſciat ſe ad accendenda Eccleſiæ luminaria mancipari, accipiat & urceolum vacuum, ad ſuggerendum vinum in Euchariſtiam ſanguinis Chriſti.* As for theſe *Cerei*, they ſhall be ſpoken of upon the next Canon. The work of *Acolythus* was to light the Candles, and provide the Wine: And from the *ratio nominis*, we may believe

lieve their Office was particularly to wait upon the Bishop, and follow him.

Canon 8. *Lector quum ordinatur, faciat de illo verbum Episcopus ad plebem, indicans ejus fidem ac vitam, atque ingenium. Posthæc spectante plebe tradat ei codicem, de quo lecturus est, dicens ad eum: accipe, & esto lector verbi Dei, habiturus, si fideliter & utiliter impleveris officium, partem cum eis, qui verbum Dei ministraverunt.* And by what hath been already cited out of *Cyprian* compared with this, it appears, that the Office of the *Lector* was judged that of the greatest importance of them all.

Canon 9. *Ostiarius quum ordinatur postquam ab Archidiacono instructus fuerit, qualiter in domo Dei debeat conversari, ad suggestionem Archidiaconi, tradat & Episcopus claves Ecclesiæ de altario, dicens: sic age, quasi redditurus Deo rationem pro his rebus, quæ his clavibus recluduntur.*

Canon 10. *Psalmista, id est, Cantor potest absque scientia Episcopi, solâ jussione Presbyteri, officium suscipere cantandi, dicente sibi Presbytero; vide, ut quod ore cantas, corde credas; & quod corde credis, operibus comprobes.* Now the *Psalmistæ* were these that were the Singers, for it was appointed in the Council of *Laodicea*, that none might sing in the Church, εἰ μὴ οἱ πεὶ τὸν ἄμβωνα, that is, those of the *suggestum*, or Pulpit.

But becauſe the 7. Canon will afford more matter of queſtion, I have reſerved it laſt. *Exorciſta quum ordinatur, accipiat de manu Epiſcopi libellum, in quo ſcripti ſunt Exarciſmi, dicente ſibi Epiſcopo: accipe, & commenda memoriæ, & habeto poteſtatem imponendi manum ſuper Energumenum, ſive baptizatum, ſive Catechumenum.*

But for examining this of the *Exorciſt*, we muſt run a little back. The *Jews* under the ſecond Temple were much addicted to Magick. In the *Talmud* it is given as a neceſſary qualification of one that might be of the *Sanhedrin*, that he ſhould be skilled in all Magick doctrines and charms. And in the inner Court of the Temple, called the *Court of Iſrael*, there was a Chamber ſaid to have been built by one *Parva* a Magician, by the Art of Magick, from whom it was called *Happarva*: And much of what they ſay of the *Bath-col*, ſeems to hint that it was an effect of Magick. Many places are alſo cited out of the *Talmud*, of their *Rabbies* killing one another by that Art; and ſo highly do they extol it, that many of them thought that all Miracles were wrought by the exact knowledg of the Cabbaliſtick Arts, and it is well enough known how that abounded among the Heathens. *Ulpian* made a Law againſt theſe Phyſicians who cured Diſeaſes by Exorciſms.

We ſee our *LORD* triumphed over the powers

powers of darkneſs, who were then raging through the World: and that the Oracles were ſilenced at this time, is confeſſed by Heathens. Neither did this gift of caſting out Devils, conferred by our *LORD* on his Diſciples, die with them, but remain ſome ages in the Church.

Tertullian ſpeaks of it as a Gift communicated to all Chriſtians. *De coronâ mil.* he tells, That ſome Soldiers did *exorciſmis fugare ſpiritus malignos*: and *de Idololatriâ, cap.* 11. *Quo ore Chriſtianus Thurarius* (this is one that offered incenſe to Idols) *ſi per templa tranſibit, fumantes aras deſpuet, & exſufflabit, quibus ipſe proſpexit: quâ conſtantiâ exorcizabit alumnos ſuos, quibus domum ſuam cellariam præſtat.* So that he hath underſtood this Power of exorcizing to have been the effect of every ſincere Chriſtian's Prayer.

Origen in his 35. *tract.* on *Matth.* condemns the form of doing it, by adjuring the Devils, ſaying that *CHRIST* hath given us power to command them. *Eſt enim Judaicum adjurare Dæmonia.*

Cyprian ſpeaks of an Exorciſm ordinarily preceding Baptiſm; but prefers the vertue of Baptiſm to that of Exorciſm, *Epiſt.* 76. *Hodie etiam geritur, ut per Exorciſtas voce humanâ & poteſtate divinâ flagelletur, & uratur, & torqueatur Diabolus; & cum exire ſe & dimittere homines DEI ſæpe dicat: in eo tamen quod dixerit, fallat* ——

Cum tamen ad aquam ſalutarem, &c. And *ad Demetrianum*, he ſaith, *O ſi audire eos velles, & videre, quando à nobis adjurantur & torquentur ſpiritalibus flagris, & verborum tormentis, de obſeſſis corporibus, ejiciuntur; quando ejulantes & gementes voce humanâ, & poteſtate divinâ flagella, & verbera ſentientes, venturum judicium confitentur.* And much of this nature is to be met with among the primitive Writers, which ſhews that the power of Exorciſing was an Authority over Devils.

Yet if this had been a formal Office, Reaſon will ſay it ſhould rather have been among the higheſt than loweſt Orders, the work being ſo great and miraculous. But from the *Areopagite*, and others, we are told, that before Baptiſm there was uſed a renunciation of the Devil, with a Prayer for caſting him out: And there is ſome probability that theſe called *Exorciſts* were only *Catechiſts*, who had ſome formuls, whereby they taught, ſuch as they inſtructed, to renounce the Devil: and this with the Prayer that accompanied it, was called an *Exorciſm*.

Nazianz. Orat. in Bapt. Ne exorciſmi medicinam aſperneris, nec ob illius prolixitatem animo concidas, nam vel ut lapis quidam Lydius eſt, ad quem exploratur, quam ſincero quiſque pectore ad baptiſmum accedat.

Cyril

Cyril of *Jeruſalem*, *Præfat. in Catech. Feſtinent pedes tui ad catecheſes audiendas, exorciſmos ſtudioſe ſuſcipe, etiamſi exorcizatus & inſpiratus jam ſis, ſalubris enim eſt tibi res iſta.* The Council of *Laodicea*, *Can.* 26. diſcharged all to *exorcize either in Churches or Houſes, except theſe appointed for it by the Biſhops.* And by the tenth Canon of *Antioch*, the *Rural Biſhops* are warranted to conſtitute *Exorciſts*, from which we ſee they could not eſteem that a wonder-working Office. And *Balſamon* in his *Sholion*, makes them one with the Catechiſts, ἐξορκισὰς ἤτοι κατηχητὰς. and on the Canon of *Laodicea*, ἐξορκίζειν τοὺτέστι κατηχεῖν λέγει. And towards the end of his Gloſs on that Canon, he ſaith, *That an Exorciſt though appointed by the* Chorepiſcopus, *and not by the Biſhop*, καλῶς κατηχήσει. And *Beveregius* cites *Harmenopolus* to the ſame purpoſe on the tenth Canon of *Antioch*. From theſe evidences it is moſt probable to think, that the *Exorciſts* at firſt were nothing but Catechiſts; but afterwards, as all things do in any tract of time degenerate, they became corrupt, beyond perhaps either theſe of the *Jews* or the *Gentiles*; ſo that the Books of *Exorciſms* now in the *Roman* Church, are ſo full of Bombaſt terms, and odd Receipts, that they are a ſtain to the Chriſtian Church.

And it is the moſt prepoſterous thing can

be imagined, that what was given in the New Testament for the greatest confirmation of the Christian faith, should be made a constant Office, and put in so mean hands. And to this I need not add the base Arts and Cheats discovered among that sort of people.

I shall conclude this long tedious Account of the sense the Ancient Church had of the several Officers in it, with some words of *Tertullian*, which I shall barely set down, without any descant on them, tho they have occasioned much perplexity to divers good Antiquaries. *Tertullian in exortatione ad uxorem, cap.* 7. saith: *Nonne & laici Sacerdotes sumus? Scriptum est regnum quoque nos & Sacerdotes DEO & Patri suo fecit. Differentiam inter Ordinem & plebem constituit Ecclesiæ authoritas, & honor per Ordinis consessum sanctificatus. Ideo ubi Ecclesiastici Ordinis non est consessus, & offers, & tingis & Sacerdos es tibi solus, sed ubi tres sunt, Ecclesia est, licet laici.* But others read these words differently, their Copies having them thus: *Sanctificatus à DEO. Ubi Ecclesiastici Ordinis est consessus, & offert, & tingit, Sacerdos qui est ibi solus: sed ubi tres, Ecclesia est, licet laici.*

FINIS.

PO-

POLYHISTOR TO BASILIUS.

YOUR desire, and my own promise, have engaged me to send you the enclosed Papers: For the trouble the reading them may give you, my Apology lies in my Obedience; and yet I have contracted things as much as I could, and perhaps have exceeded in my abridging: For had I let loose my Pen in a descant on every particular, these few Sheets had swelled to a Volume. And my design was not to act the Critick, but to be a faithful Historian. These gleanings were intended partly for my own use, and partly for the direction of some under my charge in the study of Antiquity; and were written some years ago, when I had no thoughts of making them

them more publick, than by giving a few tranſcripts of them. But now I leave the Midwifry of them to you, that you may either ſtifle this Embryo, or give it a freer Air to breath in. I have here only given you what related to the conſtitution and modelling of Churches, referring to my Obſervations on other Canons, matters that come to be treated more properly upon their Texts, as *of the adminiſtration of all the parts of the Paſtoral charge, of all their forms in Worſhip, and Church-Diſcipline, of their zeal againſt Hereſies and Schiſms, together with the methods uſed for reclaiming them; and of the poverty, ſimplicity, abſtraction from ſecular affairs, and ſublime ſanctity of the primitive Biſhops and Preſbyters.* Theſe with many other particulars, if well examined, as they will make the Work ſwell to a huge bulk, ſo they will bring pleaſure, as well as advantage, to ſuch as deſire a better Acquaintance with the ſtate of the Church of *GOD* in her beſt times; but what through the entanglements of affairs, and other avocations, what through their want of Books, are not able to engage in ſo laborious an enquiry by ſearching the Fountains themſelves.

I aſſure you, I have not gone upon truſt, having taken my Obſervations from the Wri-

tings

tings themſelves, that I have vouched for my Warrants. I once intended to have cited all the Teſtimonies I brought in *Engliſh*; and ſo to have avoided the pedantry of a *Babyloniſh Dialect*, as the *French* begin now to write. But obſerving that the foul play many have committed, hath put a jealouſie in moſt Readers of theſe Citations, where the Author's words are not quoted, I chuſed rather to hazard on the cenſure of being a Pedant, than of an unfaithful wreſter in my Tranſlations. Only to ſave the Writer the labour of writing much *Greek*, which I found unacceptable, I do often cite the *Latin* tranſlations of the *Greek Authors*. I ſhall only add, that as I was cauſing write out theſe Papers for you, there came to my hands one of the beſt Works this Age hath ſeen, *Beveregius his Synopſis Canonum*. I quickly looked over theſe learned Volumes, that I might give theſe Sheets ſuch improvements as could be borrowed from them, which indeed were not inconſiderable.

I detain you too long, but ſhall importune you no more. I leave this to your Cenſure, which I know to be ſeverely Critical in all ſuch matters. Your judgment being the wonder of all who know you, eſpecially who conſider how little your leiſure allows you, to look unto

to things ſo far without the Orb you move in: though nothing be without the vaſt Circle of your comprehenſive underſtanding, if you let looſe theſe Papers to a more publick view, let this Paper accompany them, which may ſome way expreſs the zeal of your faithfulleſt Servant, who humbly bids you *Adieu*.